

DMC

Disproportionate  
Minority Contact  
*IN THE  
ILLINOIS JUVENILE  
JUSTICE SYSTEM  
2010*



ILLINOIS JUVENILE  
JUSTICE COMMISSION

[www.ijjc.illinois.gov](http://www.ijjc.illinois.gov)

# CONTENTS

REPORT INTRODUCTION & OVERVIEW	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF DMC	10
QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF DMC	61
SURVEY DATA TABLES	84
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	174
APPENDICES & QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS	200

## About the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission

The IJJC serves as the federally mandated State Advisory Group to the Governor, General Assembly and the Illinois Department of Human Services. The Commission is responsible for ensuring the State's compliance with the Federal Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA). DMC is a core requirement of the JJDPA, requiring that the IJJC regularly collect, analyze and report data on DMC from across the state.

## Introduction

Disproportionate Minority Contact or DMC refers to the over-representation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system. Evidence of disproportionality is based on decades of empirical findings across the United States showing that youth of color make up a greater share of those in the juvenile justice system than their representation in the general youth population. The federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) of 1974 was amended in 1988 to require participating states, including Illinois, to research and assess the extent of over-representation of minorities in confinement. Over the years the DMC initiative of the Act has expanded beyond merely assessing *confinement* to include disproportionate minority *contact* at nine decision points associated with the juvenile justice system. These decision points include: arrest, referral for prosecution, diversion, detention, filing of a formal petition, cases adjudicated delinquent, probation, admission to secure confinement, and transfers to adult court.

As of 1988, the JJDPA mandates that states with an over-representation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system, such as Illinois, not only document DMC but develop and implement strategies to reduce it. The Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission (IJJC) is committed to reducing DMC at all decision points and tasked the Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) of the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) to perform a statewide assessment of DMC among juvenile justice-involved youth in Illinois. This is a summary of the findings along with informed recommendations for DMC reduction.

## Quantitative Analysis

The numbers at three key decision points represented grim and unambiguous evidence of DMC. According to the quantitative data collected, youth of color were **arrested 1.5 times** more often than white youth despite similar offending rates. Minority youth were **referred to court** at a rate **three times** more than their white counterparts and were almost **four times** more often sent to **secure confinement** for their offenses.

Relatively equal representation occurred at one decision point: **detention**. Importantly, detention is the only point where a standardized, objective screening instrument guides decision-making.

Unfortunately, data collected from the other five decision points were inconsistent across the state and is therefore significantly less reliable for the purpose of drawing accurate conclusions.

## Qualitative Analysis

CPRD interviewed and surveyed 698 juvenile justice professionals from across the state including: law enforcement officers, probation officers, members of the Department of Juvenile Justice, attorneys, and juvenile court judges. These interviews and survey responses provide important anecdotal and empirical data surrounding issues of data collection, diversity within the juvenile justice profession, juvenile justice training/practices and general awareness of DMC.

It is evident that although juvenile justice professionals are increasingly aware of DMC as a broad issue, they are less aware of the juvenile justice system's contribution to the problem. Additionally, although industry professionals are largely skeptical of DMC explanations and reduction efforts, they offer optimistic, community-based solutions.

## **Recommendations for Action:**

### **Professional education:**

Offer and mandate DMC training for all juvenile justice professionals with a particular emphasis on the nine OJJDP decision points. Such staff training should include tools for understanding 1) cultural competency, 2) adolescent development and 3) the impact of discretion on DMC prevention and reduction.

### **Targeted and Strategic DMC Reduction:**

Advocate at the state and local level for community-based strategies for DMC prevention and reduction. Such community-based strategies should include collaboration with juvenile justice professionals to build trusting coalitions.

Advocate at the state and local level for increased availability of resources for evidence-based alternatives to detention, including restorative justice practices, to reduce the overall number of youth in confinement.

### **Data Collection and Assessment:**

Facilitate annual statewide DMC focused data collection.

Mandate the use of standardized data collection techniques and processes to account for race and ethnicity at all relevant OJJDP decision points. Such a mandate will make for more thorough data collection and thus more reliable DMC assessments.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Center for Prevention Research & Development,  
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign

&

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

March 2013

## Executive Summary

The Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission requested a comprehensive qualitative and quantitative analysis be performed to assess disproportionate minority contact (DMC) among juvenile justice-involved youth in the state of Illinois. The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign performed the qualitative analysis. The CPRD both conducted targeted interviews with Key Informants from across the state and surveyed a larger group of juvenile justice practitioners. Concurrently, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) performed the quantitative analysis on DMC to gauge the extent of disproportionality statewide at the nine decision points<sup>1</sup> outlined by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP).

### Quantitative Analysis

The **quantitative** portion of the assessment focuses on calculations of the Relative Rate Index (RRI) for each county and a statewide RRI for Illinois. According to the data collected, minority youth were over-represented at the arrest decision point producing an RRI of 1.51. Put another way, youth of color were arrested 1.5 times more often than white youth despite similar offending rates. Minority youth were significantly overrepresented at two other decision points: referral to court (RRI=3.04) and secure confinement (RRI=3.81). Youth of color were referred to court at a rate **three times** more than their white peers and were almost **four times** more often sent to secure confinement for their offenses.

Minority youth were also under-represented at the points of diversion, petitions filed, adjudication, probation and transfers to adult court. The data shows that relatively equal representation only occurred at one decision point: detention (RRI=0.99). Detention is also the only decision point where a validated screening instrument is used.

The reliability of the data at each decision point is essential to understanding the analysis of the RRIs. The data considered most reliable is linked to the detention and secure confinement decision points due to the statewide standardized systems of collection. Although there are some limitations to securing race and ethnicity arrest data, the data is considered reliable. The least reliable data is linked to the remaining six decision points. Consumers of this assessment should use caution when considering the indices calculated along these decision points as many different data sources were compiled to form these results rather than originating from a single statewide source.

### Qualitative Analysis

---

<sup>1</sup> OJJDP's Nine Decision Points: Arrests, referrals for prosecution, diversion, detention, formal petitions filed, cases adjudicated delinquent, probation, admission to the Department of Juvenile Justice, and transfers to adult court.

The **qualitative** analysis section examines the causes, perceptions and contributing factors to disproportionate involvement of minority youth in the juvenile justice system. These factors have been categorized in terms of differential offending and differential treatment. The primary goal of the qualitative research and analysis was to ascertain perceptions and experiences of Illinois juvenile justice professionals.

The qualitative analysis represents data gathered from the online survey respondents and Key Informant interviews, and this data is summarized into five major sections: 1) respondent background and minority representation among juvenile justice professionals; 2) perceptions of DMC and DMC prevention efforts; 3) policies and execution of discretion along the OJJDP decision points; 4) behavioral norms in decision-making and 5) emerging explanations of DMC from Key Informants and Survey Respondents.

## **Conclusions**

### **Minority Representation within the Juvenile Justice Profession**

- Structural barriers to demographic representation and cultural competency remain prevalent in several agencies/jurisdictions and is relevant to DMC prevention efforts.

### **Professional Awareness**

- Juvenile justice professionals are increasingly aware of DMC, as an issue, but are significantly less aware of the juvenile justice system's contribution to the problem.
- Juvenile justice professionals have a wide range of explanations for the existence of DMC, but perceive little overt racism from industry professionals and are often unaware of the role of institutionalized racism.
- Juvenile justice professionals along all decision points are commonly aware of the developmentally-appropriate treatment of juveniles, and of the established goals of the juvenile justice system as ameliorative rather than punitive.

### **Staff Training**

- DMC training is not an institutionalized aspect of professional preparation and ongoing professional development in the field of juvenile justice.

### **Community Involvement**

- Those most actively involved in DMC prevention efforts stress the potential benefits from involvement with community-based organizations and coalitions.

- Research on “Promising Practices” has shown that communities with active juvenile justice community/advisory boards are more successful in addressing DMC.

#### **Data Collection, Assessment, and Evaluation Infrastructure**

- The goal of accurate, thorough, and consistent collection of DMC-related data at all decision points has yet to be achieved. While many entities capture the needed data, it is not captured for the use of DMC, thus, race and ethnicity are not consistently reported across the state.
- Reliance on the Illinois Criminal History Record Information (CHRI) System as a statewide source of arrest and diversion data leads to undercounting the least serious offending youth.<sup>2</sup>
- The lack of statewide data collection systems hinders the collection of statewide data on needed decision points (i.e., court data, probation data, etc.).

### **Recommendations for the IJJC:**

#### **Professional Awareness**

- Affirm the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission’s commitment to reducing DMC across the state.

#### **Data Collection, Assessment, and Evaluation Infrastructure**

- Facilitate annual statewide DMC data collection
- Require the use of standardized and race neutral assessment instruments.
- Build consensus and mandate the implementation of standardized data collection tools, techniques, and processes to account for race and ethnicity at all relevant OJJDP decision points.

#### **Staff Training**

- Offer and mandate cultural competency and adolescent development education/training for juvenile justice professionals, with an emphasis on their joint relevance to DMC *along with* state-level technical assistance to promote the implementation of DMC training, assessment tools, and data collection.

---

<sup>2</sup> By statute, misdemeanor offenses are not required to be submitted to the CHRI System, and arrest dispositions indicating diversion decisions are optional.

- Offer and mandate DMC training for juvenile justice professionals, with an emphasis on OJJDP decisions points, specific data collection tools and the appropriate uses of discretion.

### **Community Involvement**

- Advocate at state and local levels for the involvement of community members, organizations, and coalitions in local DMC prevention efforts.
- Advocate at state and local levels for the diminution or elimination of zero tolerance policies in schools.
- Advocate for increased availability of resources for alternatives to detention and restorative justice, and increased involvement of families of delinquent youth in these options.

# QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Center for Prevention Research & Development,  
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign  
March 2013

# Section 1: Introduction

## 1. Overview

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign was asked by the Illinois Juvenile Justice Committee (IJJC)<sup>1</sup> to perform a qualitative analysis on Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) among juvenile justice-involved youth in the state of Illinois. In order to gather qualitative data for analysis and evaluation, CPRD developed a survey for juvenile justice practitioners across the state and held “Key Informant” interviews of juvenile justice practitioners across the state (most working in counties with higher minority populations)

Since 1988, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has endeavored to address DMC in the juvenile justice system at state and local levels by confronting challenges related to: the statistical documentation of the magnitude of the problem in local jurisdictions; the reform of policies, procedures, and programs that shape case-level decisions that contribute to DMC; increased awareness of the problem among juvenile justice officials and community members; training/education for juvenile justice officials; and finally, ongoing evaluation of DMC prevention efforts.

*The primary focus for examining the existence of disproportionate minority confinement, factors contributing to it, and subsequent planning and implementing of specific strategies and actions to address related issues must be the local jurisdiction and the local community. (Pope & Leiber, 2005)*

The **qualitative** analysis section examines the causes, perceptions and contributing factors to disproportionate involvement of minority youth in the juvenile justice system. These factors have been categorized in terms of *differential offending* and *differential treatment*. The primary goal of

---

<sup>1</sup> *The IJJC serves as the federally mandated State Advisory Group to the Governor, the General Assembly and the Illinois Department of Human Services. The Commission has 25 member positions appointed by the Governor. They have training, experience, and/or special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of justice. Members serve three-year terms and serve until such time as they have been reappointed or replaced.*

*The Commission develops, reviews and approves the State's juvenile justice plan for the expenditure of funds granted to Illinois by the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). The Commission is also responsible for ensuring the State's compliance with the Federal Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act.*

*The Commission has a statutory responsibility to submit an annual report to the Governor and General Assembly that highlights the State's accomplishments, its most urgent challenges relative to juvenile justice in Illinois and its recommendations for addressing those issues*

the qualitative research and analysis was to ascertain the perceptions and experiences of Illinois juvenile justice professionals as they relate to the treatment of minority youth.

The following summary of qualitative data for both Key Informants and Survey Respondents (Section 3) is preceded by a description of the study's methodology (Section 2), and is followed by complete survey data tables (Section 4), an annotated bibliography of the scholarly literature on DMC causes and prevention (Section 5), a more extensive and alphabetical list of references (Section 6), and Appendix Items (Section 7).

## **2. Background- What Causes DMC?**

Over the past two decades, the research literature on juvenile delinquency focused on the impact and consequences of the juvenile justice system on youth's long- and short-term outcomes in education, the workplace, and social relationships. Key issues related to DMC pertain to the pathway that leads from the onset of adolescents' engagement in problem behaviors to their involvement with law enforcement, the legal system, and ultimately detention and incarceration. This pipeline to adult prison appears to begin with group-level frequencies of delinquent behaviors that are fairly consistent across adolescents' varied socio-demographic categories. Nevertheless, the juvenile justice system works in ways that result in disproportionate numbers of disadvantaged and minority youth entering and moving more deeply into the corrections system. This results in a relatively homogenous, poor, and minority population in adult prisons, as described by Michele Alexander in *The New Jim Crow* (2010).

It has been well documented that incarceration of youth often results in their being socialized and desensitized to subsequent criminal behaviors. Such deviant peer contagion effects have been widely reported in the literature (Dishion & Dodge, 2005). While there remains some debate regarding the causes and contributing factors to the pipeline to prison, it is clear that throughout this process young people involved with corrections systems are often introduced to networks that lead to further delinquency or criminal behaviors.

A number of factors have been examined in relation to the causes and contributing factors for the minority youth pipeline to prison. These factors have been broadly categorized as differential behaviors/offending, selection, and processing/treatment (Piquero, 2008; Gregory et al., 2010). There may also be a fourth dimension—differential expectations for these youth. As young people enter the pipeline, they are asked to comply or adhere to rules and regulations that could only be assured in a residential setting. Each aspect of these differences is discussed below.

First, *differential behavior* suggests that youth from different backgrounds (typically poor and minority youth) are more likely to engage in problem and illegal behaviors compared to non-minority groups, and that arrests and detention simply reflect the true state of affairs regarding delinquent behaviors. The research on this assertion is quite mixed, with a large number of studies showing no differences between racial and ethnic groups on some illegal behaviors. For example, data from the Illinois Youth Survey shows that majority youth are more likely to engage in alcohol, while African-American youth were more likely to use marijuana. In a national longitudinal study of youth, there were no such differences in the use and selling of drugs.

Second, *differential selection* suggests that disadvantaged and minority youth are more likely to be exposed to police contacts, racial/ethnic profiling, and biased sentencing, despite the fact that the prevalence of problem and delinquent behaviors is no greater for these groups than among more advantaged and majority youth cultures (Gregory et al., 2010).

Third, *differential processing* suggests the potential for greater bias and discrimination may occur within courts and correctional systems, leading to more disadvantaged and minority youth entering the correctional system and serving longer sentences. For example, some evidence suggests that legal counsel may be differentially effective between disadvantaged and advantaged youth who are more likely to employ, respectively, public defenders and private attorneys. This may contribute to differential dispositional and sentencing outcomes.

Finally, *differential expectations* describes the risk factors that emerge as poor and minority youth proceed through the pipeline and official expectations for their behavior become either unrealistic or too demanding to be met by adolescents' developmental level of responsibility and cognitive maturity. Differential expectations are best reflected in the large number of delinquent youth who violate their parole due to minor technical violations such as missed appointments, curfew violations, alcohol use, and related behaviors. This is not to suggest that youth don't commit these violations, but that such technical violations may be the result of a complex array of problems or factors beyond their control, ultimately forcing their involvement with the justice system for reasons having nothing to do with serious delinquent behavior.

At the most basic level, the ongoing debate among researchers, advocates, and policymakers in relation to the origins of DMC is often reduced—explicitly or implicitly—to the concepts of “differential offending” and “differential treatment.” The former represents DMC as the result of delinquent behavior of minority youth; the latter explores the manner in which the juvenile justice system—from initial contact through adjudication—increases the disproportionate involvement of minority youth for reasons that cannot be solely attributed to delinquent behavior.

Advocates for youth of color at the W. Haywood Burns Institute (Bell & Ridolfi, 2008) assert that “forward movement in the field is obstructed by the constant and misdirected citation of extrajudicial factors as the only causes contributing to disparities.” A prominent researcher in the field concluded “there is also truth that lies beyond and between these points, in the politico-legal climate responsible for lawmaking and its enforcement, and in the conditions and circumstances that at once place youths at risk for delinquency and also provide the rationale for juvenile justice intervention” (Bishop, 2005).

It is fair to say that federal DMC requirements, as reflected in Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) policies, are based on the following conclusion (Hanes, 2012):

*Contributing factors to DMC are multiple and complex; reducing DMC requires comprehensive and multipronged strategies that include programmatic and systems change efforts.*

This statement implies that whatever the origins and rates of minority delinquency, the treatment by the justice system of those individuals in our society that are the most vulnerable in terms of

both age and social status has important implications for the outcomes associated with that vulnerability. The programmatic and systemic change efforts, when seen in the discretionary and highly interpersonal context of juvenile justice decision making, are dependent on the responses, interpretations, and decisions of juvenile justice officials, from initial police contact through adjudication.

Thus the following summary of qualitative data from Survey Respondents and Key Informant interviews represents an attempt to document perceptions and experiences regarding the existence and nature of DMC in the system, the effectiveness of current remedies as witnessed by interviewees, and the willingness and potential of these juvenile justice professionals and their colleagues to actively participate in ongoing system change efforts.

The “promising practices” that have been formulated to this point (Cabaniss et al., 2007) face serious but not insurmountable obstacles to effective implementation at state and local levels; defining these obstacles while assessing progress already achieved are the primary goals of this study, and are reflected in the conclusions at the end of Section 3.

## **Section 2: Qualitative Research Methodology**

CPRD's contribution to the IJJC's Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) assessment for the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission (IJJC) was to employ qualitative research methods in order to assess Illinois' juvenile justice agencies' policies, procedures, decision making, and culture for handling juveniles entering or moving through the juvenile justice system—focusing on matters central or relevant to the problem of DMC. The qualitative analysis focused on the OJJDP's nine juvenile justice decision points: arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication hearing, probation, confinement, and transfers to adult court. In order to fully assess these issues CPRD developed research based questions for one-on-one Key Informant<sup>2</sup> (KI) interviews, and also developed questions for an online survey for juvenile justice practitioners across the state. All questions were discussed and approved by the IJJC DMC Committee. These KIs and juvenile justice practitioners were all in ideal positions to understand the processes that affect one or many of the OJJDP nine decision points, and to understand how they affect the young people involved at each step in the process.

The qualitative research questions addressed the following areas of interest and concern in relation to Disproportionate Minority Contact:

- Juvenile offender's race/ethnicity assessment and reporting throughout the OJJDP decision point process
- Perceptions/stereotypes/factors/social contexts that influence juvenile justice interactions and decision making

---

<sup>2</sup> Key Informants are Illinois juvenile justice practitioners in various agencies throughout the Illinois juvenile justice system.

- The use of discretion and the potential for bias in the juvenile justice system, especially in relation to OJJDP decision points
- Policies/procedures/trainings/tools relevant to the prevention of DMC within the juvenile justice system

## **The Development of a Juvenile Justice Practitioner Database**

Identifying and soliciting KIs and online survey participants was a large undertaking. The CPRD team collected contact information on as many State of Illinois juvenile justice agencies and applicable social service providers as feasible. Numerous phone calls were made to solicit names and contact information of juvenile justice staff, and extensive internet searches were conducted in order to access agencies' staff contact information and public listservs. CPRD acquired a juvenile justice practitioner database that Loyola Law School previously created. CPRD added additional contact information, resulting in a more comprehensive list for our DMC interview and survey solicitation effort. Once our best effort to obtain names/contact information was completed, CPRD called and/or emailed individuals in the various juvenile justice agencies in order to solicit their participation in a KI interview and/or online survey. The final juvenile justice practitioner list used for this solicitation totaled 1495 contacts.

## **Key Informants**

One component of CPRD's research entailed personal interviews with KI staff in various juvenile justice agencies throughout Illinois. CPRD interviewers used a uniform list of guiding questions to prompt KIs in facilitating discussion. During the interview, interviewees may have also been asked follow-up questions that were intended to "dig deeper" into their impressions, thoughts, and experiences related to DMC.

The KI participant list included individuals who worked with juveniles in the Illinois juvenile justice system at all of the nine OJJDP Decision Points:

- Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ)
- Illinois Judiciary
- Illinois Juvenile Detention Centers
- Illinois Departments of Probation and Court Services
- Illinois police officers – at statewide, county and city levels, in a variety of sworn positions (including some retired)
- Illinois service providers
- Illinois State's Attorneys and/or Assistant State's Attorneys
- Public Defenders and/or Assistant Public Defender's
- Juvenile justice policy makers and advocates

A total of 38 confidential and anonymous KI interviews were held from April 2012 thru August 2012. Interviewees were asked to share their experience and knowledge about their work and their perceptions of the Illinois juvenile justice system, with an emphasis on DMC. Each KI interview was approximately one hour long. The goal was to encourage participation from a

wide range of agencies and diverse Illinois counties, while at the same time focusing solicitation on those counties with the highest minority rates in the state. The KIs provided a rich variety of backgrounds, positions, and perspectives that allowed them to contribute facts, impressions, and insights.

While common questions were asked of all KIs, there were some unique questions for each agency interview type. The questions asked of the KIs are in Appendices 1 - 8. These interviews primarily focused on awareness and explanation of DMC among those juvenile justice professionals interviewed, in terms of both their own workplace experiences and their perceptions of the juvenile justice system in general. In addition, questions specifically addressed issues pertaining to interaction with juveniles, social conditions, data collection, evaluation tools, rules and procedures, and the appropriate use of discretion in juvenile justice decision making. Finally, Key Informants were asked more general questions about their typical treatment of juveniles at work, and their perceptions of cultural norms for such treatment in their departments.

Interviews therefore elicited concrete information regarding the awareness and importance of DMC in the working lives and agency contexts of Key Informants, as well as perceptions/interpretations of the social and organizational contexts that shape their interactions with delinquent youth—in particular minority delinquent youth. In some cases, these perceptions and interpretations might be seen to indicate various levels of willingness and/or ability to actively address DMC in their workplace decision making, and various levels of optimism regarding the potential effectiveness of such procedures and strategies. These perceptions and interpretations may in turn have implications for the effective implementation of DMC prevention measures and for subsequent outcomes for minority juveniles who are at risk for long-term involvement in the criminal justice system.

When potential KIs were contacted and asked to participate in a taped interview, a description of the research project was provided to them. If they agreed to participate, a date and time for the interview was arranged. Everyone was provided with the list of interview questions prior to the interview. All KI interview responses were voluntary, confidential, and anonymous, and this information was provided and stated to each KI prior to the interview.

### Data Analysis

Once each interview was completed, the taped session was transcribed. When all interviews were completed and transcribed, the narrative for each interview was loaded into a qualitative analysis software tool: “Atlas ti”. The next step was to code the transcript’s narrative in order to assist the researchers in understanding each interview to its fullest extent: to identify emergent themes and concepts, areas of concern, and acceptance and use of promising practices. Researchers reviewed the interview data in depth, and incorporated the KI’s characterizations, comments and conclusions into the Summary and Analysis of Qualitative Data (Section 3).

### **Survey (online and paper)**

The second qualitative research component to CPRD's work was the development of a research based survey for Illinois juvenile justice practitioners (Appendix 9). This survey was developed after an extensive literature review of DMC and related issues.

The survey's intent was to understand the juvenile justice practitioner's perception of how they see the Illinois juvenile justice system and how they perceive their role and the role of other practitioners. We asked survey respondents information about their demographics and:

- Juvenile's Race/Ethnicity Assessment and Reporting
- Perceptions/Social Conditions/Stereotypes/Factors that influence Juvenile Justice Decision Making
- Discretion, Discrimination and Bias in the Juvenile Justice system
- Rules/Procedures/Trainings/Decision Making/Evidence-based Practices within the Juvenile Justice system

The target groups for the survey were the same as the Key Informants:

- Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ)
- Illinois Judiciary
- Illinois Juvenile Detention Centers
- Illinois Departments of Probation and Court Services
- Illinois, County and City Police Officers in a variety of sworn positions (including some retired)
- Illinois Service Providers
- Illinois State's Attorneys and/or Assistant State's Attorney's
- Public Defenders and/or Assistant Public Defender's
- Juvenile Justice Policy makers
- Sworn Police Officers (State, County, City level)
- State's Attorneys and staff

This survey was delivered in two ways. One, a paper survey was created and distributed at the Illinois Juvenile Officers Association conference, on June 13, 2012, in Peoria, IL. 111 surveys were collected from the police officers that attended the event. And two, an online survey (exact copy of the paper survey) was created using ReMark software. 548 online surveys were received, making a grand total of 639 survey responses.

The juvenile justice practitioner's database (discussed previously) was the tool that was used to send out the online survey. In the solicitation email the participants received, they were encouraged to share the survey link with other juvenile justice practitioners they knew. The research team hoped that more practitioners would then receive the survey than only those they had contact information on.

CPRD consulted several Illinois leaders in the field of criminal/juvenile justice to determine ways to reach and engage the various target groups. CPRD staff determined that police officers would be the most difficult group to access, they comprise the largest target group who has contact with youth and they have significant discretion involving the youth's entry into the

juvenile justice system. Consequently, a modest case incentive was provided to this target group.

Since frequent survey solicitations are made of police entities, it was further recommended to have a police entity support the survey initiative to let police officers know that this was vetted as an important and purposeful project. The Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police (ILACP) did announce and support the survey efforts in their August 9, 2012, *ILACP Weekly Bulletin Alert*, (Appendix 10) which helped to reach a larger population than we had in our juvenile practitioner database alone.

The online survey was opened on August 6, 2012 for all juvenile justice practitioners to complete, and closed on August 27, 2012. However, after each Key Informant interview was held, the survey link would be emailed to the KI asking them to voluntarily complete it and share it with any interested colleagues.

#### Data Analysis

Once all paper surveys were received they were all scanned into Teleform for compilation of data. The online survey data and paper survey data were then imported into SPSS for frequency analysis and cross tabulations that were performed by the CPRD research staff. Data tables are displayed throughout the research narrative, and more can be found in Section 4 – Survey Data Tables.

### **University of Illinois Institutional Review Board Requirements**

A University of Illinois Institutional Review Board (IRB) application, for the protection of human subjects, was written specifically for the DMC qualitative research. Confidentiality of all data has been strictly maintained throughout the project.

#### Key Informants:

When Key Informants were solicited to participate in an interview, they were told that the interviews would be anonymous and confidential. Consequently the list of individual KIs will not be provided for general circulation, but only available to CPRD research staff. No KI is identifiable in this document by name, identifier, or role; nor will they be identifiable in any publicly available source or other published or non-published report.

Voluntary verbal consent to participate and consent to tape record the interview was attained by the interviewer prior to the beginning of each interview (Appendix 11 - Statement of Confidentiality - Consent to Tape Record).

#### Survey Respondents:

The target population for the survey respondents were Police Officers, State's Attorneys and/or staff, Public Defenders and/or staff, Judiciary, Court Services staff (Probation and Detention), Department of Juvenile Justice staff, and employees of any other juvenile justice agency in Illinois that make decisions about involved youth traveling through the juvenile justice system. The survey was completely anonymous and confidential. No names or personal identifiers were

asked for or collected from the respondents. When responding to the online survey, email addresses and survey responses were not connected. Those police officers who received an incentive for their participation consented to provide an email for receipt of the electronic gift card; however, no incentive email address was ever associated with survey responses.

CPRD researchers informed survey respondents regarding the voluntary and confidential nature of the survey, as well as participants' right to refuse an interview or terminate it at any time. The Informed Consent Statement (Appendix 12) that was received with the survey explained that there was no link between email address and survey responses.

Both the survey and Key Informant interviews created no more than minimal risk to subjects, because subjects were acting in their official capacity to comment on their knowledge, perceptions, and beliefs in a voluntary and non-coercive context.

## **Section 3: Summary and Analysis of Qualitative Data**

### **Overview**

Respondents for this qualitative study include both interview Key Informants (KIs) and survey respondents (SRs). This summary and analysis will include both groups. The data will be summarized in six major sections addressing: Respondent background and juvenile justice agency personnel issues; perceptions of DMC and DMC prevention efforts; policies, procedures, and discretion along the nine OJJDP decisions points; behavioral norms in juvenile justice interactions, processing, and decision making; emerging themes regarding explanations of DMC; and conclusions. Conclusions address readiness and capacity for DMC prevention at individual and organizational levels.

Each section will highlight Key Informant interviews and survey respondent data as such data pertain to the topical discussion. Survey data was thoroughly reviewed and sorted in multiple ways:

- Overall frequency analysis of survey responses
- Frequency analysis of survey responses grouped by occupation
- Frequency analysis of survey responses grouped by 4 county groups (Cook County, Collar Counties, Medium Counties and Rural Counties)
- Frequency analysis of survey responses grouped by job experience
- Frequency analysis of survey responses grouped by three DMC pilot sites

While some of the survey data tables will be interspersed throughout the Summary and Analysis of Qualitative Data section, the reader can also find all survey data tables in Section 4.

The first section (Characteristics/Demographics) will address respondent professional roles and demographics; listing of their "Target County" (high minority) jurisdictions; their perceptions of

the demographic representation of their agency's personnel; and the emerging theme of recruitment and retention issues in relation to minority personnel.

The second section (DMC Perceptions and Prevention) will address respondents' familiarity with DMC and their perceptions of it as a departmental and systemic issue; ratings of agency DMC problems and prevention efforts; their experience with and benefits from DMC training; acceptance and practice of DMC prevention; proposals to change DMC prevention requirements; views on promoting an agency culture of DMC prevention; and the emerging theme of perceptions of the need for community-level support for DMC prevention.

The third section (Juvenile Justice Policies, Procedures, and Decision Making) will address policies and procedures in the juvenile justice system as experienced and perceived by respondents; the practice of discretion along the various OJJDP decision points; the perceived appropriateness of such discretion; methods of data collection pertaining to the race and ethnicity of juvenile suspects; tools used for assessment and evaluation along the decision points; and the prevalence of the use of culturally sensitive services and restorative justice remedies.

The fourth section (Behavioral Norms in the Juvenile Justice System) will address respondents' perceptions of norms and culture regarding the treatment of juveniles in their agency.

The fifth section (Perceived Factors Influencing the Treatment of Juveniles; Explanations of DMC) will address respondents' explanations of DMC, emerging themes categorized as: socio-economic and familial contexts; contextual issues related to mental health and/or parental support; contextual issues related to zero tolerance in schools and/or gang activity; systemic issues related to juvenile justice decision points; and issues of race and culture.

The sixth section will offer conclusions and recommendations based on respondent data.

## **1. Key Informant & Survey Respondent's Characteristics; Agency Demographics; Hiring, Recruitment, and Retention Issues**

### **Key Informant and Survey Respondent Characteristics**

This section addresses the demographic characteristics of 38 Key Informants (KIs) and 660 Survey Respondents (SRs); their perceptions of the demographic representation of their agency's personnel in relation to the community; and the emerging themes of hiring, recruitment, and retention issues in relation to minority representation.

The following tables display some general demographics of the KI and SR population. Both groups are highly experienced, with over two-thirds having worked more than a decade in their current field. However, a general contrast between KIs and SRs are reflected in professional roles: KIs are relatively evenly distributed among police, court services, and adjudication, while over three-quarters of SRs are police. Males constitute 55% of KIs and 77% of SRs; minorities constitute no more than one-eighth of either group. Thus, while allowing for the above

differences, both a typical KI and a typical SR is a white male who has worked in juvenile justice since prior to 2000.

More demographic information about the SRs is available, as can be seen in the following two sections:

**Key Informant Demographics:**

**Table 1: Illinois counties represented in KI interviews**

15 Illinois counties represented by the 38 Key Informants * Among 19 (of 102) counties with highest minority population (>18%)		
Champaign*	Macon*	Rock island*
Cook*	Madison	Sangamon*
Franklin	McLean	St. Clair*
Jefferson	Peoria*	Statewide*
Kendall*	Pulaski*	Winnebago*

For greater detail of Illinois county-level minority demographics in relation to both Key Informant and Survey Respondent representation, see Appendix 13.

When soliciting KIs, the research team focused on obtaining KIs from different and diverse counties throughout the state (large, small, rural, urban, high minority general population, etc.). Due to the the intensity of the solicitation effort, the KI population was relatively small.

**Table 2: KI Current Occupation**

KI current occupation	n=38
Department of Juvenile Justice	13%
Detention/Probation/Court Service Staff	24%
Judge/Other Court Official/State's Attorney/Public Defender	26%
Police/Law Enforcement	26%
Other	11%

**Table 3: KI Gender**

KI Gender	n=38
Male	55%
Female	45%

The 38 KIs largely had extensive experience in the juvenile justice system. On average KIs had 15 years of juvenile justice experience, with a median of 13 years. Their length of experience ranges from two to 38 years; 33 have more than five years of experience, 22 more than 10 years, and 14 more than 16 years.

**Survey Respondents’ Demographics:**

The research team hoped for a large, diverse population across the state of Illinois. This was achieved with 660 responses from 62% of all Illinois counties represented (large, small, rural, urban, high minority, etc.). When reviewing the data tables, note that the n (total number of responses) may vary with each question since not every SR answered each question. When a question allowed multiple answer selections, there may not be any responses provided. More data tables on the SRs can be found in Section 4.

**Table 4: Illinois counties represented by Survey Respondents**

<b>Illinois counties represented = 63 (62% of all IL counties) n=660</b> <b>* Among 19 (of 102) counties with highest minority population (&gt;18%)</b>				
Adams	DuPage*	Knox	McHenry	Stephenson
Boone*	Edwards	Lake*	McLean	Tazewell
Brown*	Franklin	LaSalle	Montgomery	Union
Carroll	Fulton	Lawrence	Ogle	Vermilion
Champaign*	Grundy	Lee	Peoria*	Warren
Clark	Henry	Livingston	Randolph	Wabash
Clay	Iroquois	Macon*	Richland	Whiteside
Clinton	Jackson*	Macoupin	Rock Island*	Will*
Coles	Jasper	Madison	Saline	Williamson
Cook*	Jefferson	Marion	Sangamon	Winnebago*
Crawford	Kane*	Mason	Schuyler	Woodford
DeKalb	Kankakee*	Massac	Shelby	Statewide
DeWitt	Kendall*	McDonough	St. Clair*	

**Table 5: SR Current Occupation**

SR current occupation	n=659
Department of Juvenile Justice	1%
Detention/Probation/Court Service Staff	12%
Judge/Other Court Official/State’s Attorney/Public Defender	7%
Police/Law Enforcement	77%
Other	3%

**Table 6: SR Time in the Field**

<b>Year SR began working in current field</b>	<b>n=654</b>
Prior to 2000	65%
2000 -2004	18%
2005 -2009	15%
2010 – present	2%

**Table 7: SR Age**

<b>SR Age</b>	<b>n=645</b>
<20	0%
20-30	6%
31-40	32%
41-50	36%
51-60	21%
>=61	5%

**Table 8: SR Ethnicity**

<b>SR Ethnicity</b>	<b>n=636</b>
Hispanic	6%
Non-Hispanic	94%

**Table 9: SR Race**

<b>SR Race</b>	<b>n=643</b>
Black/African American	6%
White/Caucasian	89%
Asian	1%
Native American or Native Alaskan	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0%
Multi-racial	2%
Other	1%

**Table 10: SR Gender**

<b>SR Gender</b>	<b>n=635</b>
Male	77%
Female	23%

### **Perceptions of Agency Demographics; Hiring, Recruitment, and Retention Issues**

We asked KIs and SRs how closely the demographics of their communities (race/ethnicity) match the demographics of agency personnel. The comments and emerging themes below refer to KI interviews. In regard to juvenile justice professionals other than police officers, who deal with the larger community, the “community” is understood to be the population served at the various OJJDP decision points throughout the juvenile justice system, from detention centers to youth centers, including attorneys and judges involved in the process.

Proportionate minority representation was claimed by several, but by no means a majority, of police KIs. Moreover, as juveniles move through the system from arrest to adjudication, they are increasingly unlikely to find proportionate numbers of minorities represented among personnel in relation to the population being served, including in detention centers and probation departments, and especially among state’s attorneys, public defenders, and judges.

For KIs, responses to questions regarding the demographics of the department/agency in relation to the community are categorized by police, court services (detention, probation), and adjudication (judges, state’s attorneys, public defenders). The theme of structural obstacles to minority representation in terms of recruitment, hiring, and retention will be elaborated in these three professional contexts.

### **Minority Representation**

#### **- Law Enforcement**

One KI officer made a pointed observation about the lack of and need for proportionate representation:

We get a lot of officers and we get a lot of personnel from smaller towns, and they may have been police officers in other communities where, there’s just not a whole lot of action there. And so when they come to our department, I think that it’s their thought that they want to go someplace where they can kick ass and take names, so to speak. ... And then - unfortunately when they come to our city, whose asses are they kicking and whose names are they taking, and unfortunately it happens to be - it can be young blacks and Hispanics. And that’s kind of where it seems like that’s okay to maybe target them that way, or look at them that way.

Responses from two police officers stated that the demographics of their departments adequately matched the population of their urban community; one referred to a predominately African-American community, the other to a Latino community.

However, another stated that the police department “historically, has never been representative of our community.” An officer also noted that local commanders may be selected for “political reasons” to match the community’s majority race/ethnicity, in order to compensate for disproportionate numbers of white officers in some heavily minority districts.

In one city for which a KI claimed adequate minority representation, it was also stated that recruitment presented a difficult challenge:

*... it took great effort to do that because it was - the recruiting was difficult. They tried many different things for recruiting, and that’s a different story.*

#### **- Court Services**

Two detention/probation KIs reported clear personnel/community mismatches at their detention centers; however, hard-earned minority representation was reported for another:

*That’s difficult because a lot of my applicants are Caucasian. I don’t get very many Hispanic applications and I don’t get very many African American applicants either. I get more African Americans than I do Hispanics. We do try to hire applicants that are going to mirror our population here. That’s difficult. We have more now than we’ve ever had in the past, so we’ve made progress towards that and that would at least give the DMC youth that are coming here ... it would make them feel a little bit like there’s more hope and people they can relate to here.*

One emerging theme explaining demographic disparities expressed by KIs from a probation department and a detention center referred to union regulations that govern hiring, layoff, and rehiring of employees as comprising a structural obstacle to attaining a more demographically representative workforce through new hires. One also referred to a probation staff that is “in for the long haul,” also undermining possible efforts to hire minorities that may be under-represented among older personnel. These tenures, it was noted, may partly result from limited alternative opportunities in the local economy.

Moreover, it was suggested that minorities may in any event be scarce among the applicant pool:

*You know we talk about when we hire probation services officers we try to get people who are African American. We have very few applications, but we are very aware of that.*

#### **- Adjudication**

One judge affirmed the proportionate representation of minorities among juvenile judges in that jurisdiction. Among the eight remaining KI, only two minority personnel were noted as working in similar roles as the KI.

## **Summary**

The theme of low retention rates among minority personnel emerged in interviews with these nine KIs. First, work with juveniles is seen as a step up the career ladder in terms of both pay and prestige for individuals from all backgrounds. Second, minorities are scarce, and thus are in particular demand even once hired. In relation to prosecutors, one KI stated:

*I think the number of minority professionals as a whole is low; it's difficult to get minority professionals to move to or stay in central Illinois. And then on top of that, to get minority attorneys to be prosecutors is very difficult. It's not seen as a profession that's traditionally associated with minorities, and minority attorneys are very highly sought-after in the legal world.*

KIs are generally aware of demographic disparities between personnel and the community. In many cases they see the value of increased minority representation among juvenile justice personnel, while at the same time recognizing structural obstacles to achieving this.

## **2. Survey/Interview Responses: Basic Perceptions about DMC**

This section addresses respondents' familiarity with and understanding of DMC; perceptions of its salience as a departmental and systemic issue; ratings of agency DMC problems and prevention efforts; experience and results of DMC training; acceptance and practice of DMC prevention; proposals to change DMC prevention requirements; perceptions on promoting an agency culture of DMC prevention; and the emerging theme of perceptions of the need for community-level support for DMC prevention.

### **Understanding DMC; DMC as a Departmental and Systemic Issue**

Respondents were asked about their familiarity with DMC and how they define it. A majority of KIs claimed a basic familiarity with the concept, and were able to define it at a general level. Those that demonstrated a more elaborate understanding of the issue were concentrated among those directly involved with DMC prevention.

One police KI provided historical perspective:

*... the issue of minority kids seeing the criminal justice system at a rate that's different than white kids has been an issue for 30 years or more. In my experience as a youth officer - when I started I started as a youth officer in 1979 ... my recollection is that we had a diverse, pretty diverse clientele that we were seeing in the juvenile division at the police department and sometime in the mid-'80s that really drastically changed to predominantly minority kids. And this is purely anecdotal but I would bet you that I'm not too far off the mark to say that*

*80 percent or more of the kids they see in the juvenile division today are minority kids and not white kids.*

KIs were asked whether they see DMC as an issue in their department and in the broader juvenile justice system; in either context, only a minority believed that to be the case. Moreover, recognition of the issue in their department or in the system did not imply recognition of agency-level unfairness, but of broader social realities. Comments from two KIs reflect this:

*But what’s going on now - there’s this very big social issue with the quote unquote minority community that it’s - it’s a social norm. It’s a cultural norm within black and Hispanic communities ... that honestly, yeah is disproportionately they are committing more crime.*

*Our population of kids that are on probation that are of color is higher than the other population. I have this discussion with my boss a lot about that and his view is most of it, he feels, as opposed to the DMC, a lot of it has to do with poverty. Unfortunately, a lot of the people of color come from impoverished families. So yeah, I think it is an issue here as far as the numbers. You want to say it isn’t, but it is. They are over-represented in our system and in our caseload.*

In summary, increased awareness of DMC among juvenile justice professionals does not in most cases lead to an increased level of curiosity or criticism of departmental or systemic policies and procedures.

Tables 11 and 12 present Survey Responses to questions addressing the familiarity of DMC. These data reflect the comments of the Key Informants.

**Table 11: SRs familiarity with the concept of DMC**

SR - How familiar are you with the concept of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system?	Not Familiar at All	Somewhat Familiar	Very Familiar
n=655	53%	34%	13%

**Table 12: SRs colleagues’ familiarity with the concept of DMC**

SR - How familiar are your professional colleagues with the concept of DMC in the juvenile justice system?	Not Familiar at All	Somewhat Familiar	Very Familiar	Don’t Know
n=652	41%	31%	7%	21%

**Assessing the Magnitude of DMC Problem; Assessing Current DMC Prevention Efforts**

KIs were asked to rate from one to five their perceptions of how large an issue DMC presents in their departmental area, with one being the least serious and five the most serious. A minority rated the problem as either average or above average (three to five) in seriousness. Generally, DMC is not seen as a serious problem in the immediate professional workplace among KIs.

KIs were also asked to rate their agency's DMC prevention efforts, with one being low and five being high. The majority of KIs rated these prevention efforts as below average (one or 2) in addressing the DMC problem. Comments from two police officers illustrate this trend:

*They teach cultural awareness, but they really don't teach disproportionate minority contact. They don't teach intervention or dealing with juveniles or anything like that.*

*I would say that there is obviously a lot of concern with crimes committed by and against juveniles. But I don't see a lot of new programs coming out that would address any of that.*

In contrast, KIs working in the areas of detention and probation more often point to concrete efforts to prevent DMC in terms of assessment tools. A probation officer stated:

*By utilizing the standardized scoring instrument, I think by utilizing the YASI that we have really made some progress. I think providing training that is for staff about cultural sensitivity, we're trying to work on those areas.*

Similarly, KIs who have worked most closely with DMC predictably have a more positive assessment of DMC prevention efforts:

*Our local community, the Juvenile Justice Council, we have the state's attorney on board, we have the judges on board, community organizations, not for profit organizations, so we do have a close knit community that is concerned about our young people.*

It is evident from these responses that many members of law enforcement would be supportive of increasing more explicit DMC prevention efforts with input from the officers.

### **DMC Training Experience**

Respondents were asked whether they have attended formal DMC training, key points that they took away from such training, and whether they thought their training to be worthwhile. The majority of respondents had not attended DMC or DMC-related training.

Among KIs, detention and probation professionals as well as state's attorneys and judges attended such training with greater frequency than police. Some trainings mentioned were those delivered by the W. Haywood Burns Institute, the Annie E. Casey Foundation (Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, JDAI), a local Juvenile Justice Council, OJJDP, the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts (AOIC), and the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS).

Those who attended training were asked whether it proved to be worthwhile; responses were generally quite positive. One probation officer reported that

*... because DMC was driving it, it kind of forced us or gave us the permission. It gave us the confidence that, well, this isn't a probation driven thing. This is DMC driven, and this is a group consensus that we need to be doing this.*

A probation officer summarized the results of the Burns Institute training:

*[One major takeaway was] the emphasis on policy recommendations, program change recommendations, and practice change recommendations, based on solid data. A second take away is the consideration of how we determine the racial and ethnic groups that are impacted by our system, and so looking at data and desegregating data by race, ethnicity, gender, geography, and originating charged offense. ... and a third being community involvement. Community involvement in the decision making process as a collaborative partner, not necessarily as an ancillary or secondary consideration to examination, and change recommendations of this issue. So, those primary takeaways have been how we have engaged in this work, how I have encouraged my colleagues, and how our system has adopted the work on this issue.*

One judge reported:

*I thought it was very worthwhile. We talked about what some of the causes of this are, from the initial police contact through the prosecutorial discretion and the charging, to the intake, to the handling by the probation officer, to the court decision we talked about that from beginning to end. It's always a question of why that happens and how it can be done differently and what we can learn from it to prevent it, so I'm always aware of that.*

A judge who thought training was worthwhile also stressed the need for police officers to attend such training:

*I do think that the training needs to have been done with those individuals who make that initial contact. Because the training for me, I'm not one of the ones that bring them into the system. But it just identifies the problems.*

A police officer who has not attended training agreed with the need for it:

*We have to go to square one. I feel that we have to go from stage 1 to the screening and maybe even doing scenarios. Not only in the academy and academy also doing scenarios for culture diversity, also understanding how critical it is to work on preventive measures and that we have the key as individuals. As individuals we have the key to change people's lives.*

Similarly, a detention center professional who has not attended training stated:

*I do believe it's out there and I do believe DMC is a valid issue. Once you're at that point, the approach to take is training officers, getting them out there, putting out the research and the data that supports it and acknowledging that and training on that concept and then by better educating those in the system, hopefully that will address the problem and we'll slowly start to see change come about in addressing DMC with our youth.*

Those KIs with the most direct experience with training and mandates for training—stressed the complexity and difficulty of training programs:

*It's just been my experience when there is clarity on expectations - I mean, not to put burdens on people or an agency, or a community, but when you say, "Here is how you approach decreasing DMC", and you develop a mandate with understanding that locales or communities can develop a strategy that is germane to their particular issue. Not to put people in a box, but to say, "Here are steps to decreasing DMC".*

A KI commented on the pitfalls of optional DMC training:

*In many cases if it's just a part of a menu, an a la carte, and if it's optional then there will be many, many people who will opt not to expose themselves to it. But every workplace has certain things that are made mandatory, and that's an example of the kind of decisions that an administrator or an agency head or an elected official could do. They could push to make certain kind of training, certain kinds of information dissemination mandatory. I think any community where there is evidence of disproportionality that pretty much everybody needs to be trained on what it is, why it exists, why it persists, what we can do about it, and specifically what our strategies are for addressing it. I haven't really seen that in very many places where it's been made mandatory.*

Another KI stressed the importance of community relationships as an aspect of the training process:

*I took away from the conference (another) coordinator's passion about the community getting involved in preventing DMC. And she was really community driven. She had the data but I guess we connected more on the passion of the community to help the young people and come up with different diversion programs to help.*

In summary, responses from KIs about the quality of training experiences reveal a general lack of DMC training for police officers, and the importance of more opportunities for these first responders. KI responses, including those who have worked most closely with DMC prevention, also stress the importance of training in relation to data collection, shared data, best practices, and community involvement. If DMC training is to assume a central role in DMC policy and prevention programs, it will require both standardized and mandated components, as well as localized and community-focused strategies. KIs revealed a general awareness of these needs,

including among those who have not yet attended training sessions—for example, this DJJ professional:

*Yes. I think it just has to be training. I mean training right from the beginning anybody that works in this, or even law enforcement. They need training, especially in DJJ or juvenile justice. I mean we have prisons down south where the majority of staff are not a minority but Caucasian, but they're still dealing with minority youth. And up here it's the opposite - we have minority staff, but we also deal with Caucasian youth. So I think training would help, right from the Academy, right from when you start.*

Tables 13-15 display the survey responses related to DMC training. Table 13 shows that **78%** of all respondents had never participated in any DMC training, while **only 18%** of the respondents indicated they had. Table 14 and 15 then looks a little deeper at that 18% that indicated they had attended some DMC training. Table 14 displays that **only 15%** felt that the DMC training changed how they do their job “a good bit,” while 50% said it did affect their job “some.” However in Table 15, **76%** of these same 18% in Table 13 indicate they are not making any different decisions towards the involved youth after their training than they were before.

**Table 13: Participation in DMC Meetings/Trainings**

SR- Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?	Yes	No	Don't Know
n=654	18%	78%	4%

**Table 14: Impact of DMC Training on Job Performance**

(These responses represent the 18% that responded “Yes” to Table 13)

SR - If you have participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC, to what extent has your participation changed how you do your job?	Not at All	Some	A Good Bit
n=118	35%	50%	15%

**Table 15: Impact of DMC Training on Decision-Making**

(These responses represent the 18% that responded “Yes” to Table 13)

SR - Do you believe that you are making different decisions towards the involved youth than you were before you participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?	Yes	No

n=118	24%	76%
-------	-----	-----

## Acceptance of DMC Prevention

KIs do not widely recognize DMC as an issue of above average magnitude; nor do they perceive prevention efforts to be clearly helpful. Given this baseline level of awareness, responses to questions regarding the “wide” acceptance and practice of DMC prevention in the juvenile justice system reveal a critical set of perceptions and attitudes. Aside from some qualified positive views in terms of general awareness and procedures, these perceptions and attitudes range from skepticism to negativity regarding acceptance and prevention practice.

Pessimistic views of prevention efforts among those who do not recognize the magnitude of DMC, may be responsible for the devaluation of the problem. In contrast, those who do recognize the problem are evidently frustrated with the lack of visible progress resulting from such efforts. In such cases those responses do not reflect a minimization of the DMC problem on the part of KI, but recognition of the obstacles and challenges in implementing successful prevention efforts. Nevertheless, such responses indicate a readiness for more substantial commitment to DMC prevention efforts.

For example, a KI and member of law enforcement stated:

*So it's been very difficult to pitch the preventing approach to someone who doesn't believe in that and who has a more aggressive approach to reduce violence - cuffing people. It's difficult because it becomes a culture. And so when we have - I heard this from a professor once, that culture eats strategy for lunch.*

Another police KI responded:

*I don't, and I think that's because of the lack of knowledge. Our department really doesn't teach that, which I think is a shame. I mean they don't really stress that. The only reason I've heard about it is because I have a masters in police psychology. So I've read about and our department doesn't really stress psychology which I really think they need to also.*

A probation officer addressed the issue of academic training:

*It is not yet widely accepted... As students graduate from undergraduate school, as they graduate from graduate school or professional school, they enter into a system with the ideology that they learned in the classroom. And only recently has this issue of disproportionate minority contact and the over representation of people of color in systems begun to be discussed in the classroom. There are generations of students who have graduated and left a classroom who are only being introduced to it in some ancillary way, and so their understanding of it is not as robust as it should be for them to have the type of impact that they can as system partners.*

While a second probation KI suggested:

*I think more people are aware of it now than ten years ago, but I still don't think people have been trained on it completely. I think they've heard it and they're familiar with the term and possibly what it means, but I don't think they really know how that applies to their job sometimes or their role in the juvenile justice system.*

A third probation professional stated:

*I think it's probably all on the surface. I think people probably agree and yes, this is an issue because you can kind of see it on paper. But when it comes down to everybody's day-to-day operations, whether it's really that big of a deal, I know the important people that are involved in the project think it's great, but I would have to say overall no.*

A public defender commented:

*I don't think it's on their radar. I think that that's partially because the ... you know, there's always some program that comes along, and it's never a front-end program, really.*

More pointedly, another KI asserted:

*There is certain institutional racism that is historic, and it has been part of the fabric of this country. Until that changes, This DMC has lost the effort that's coming here ... the work the Burns Institution is doing. I highly applaud OJDDP and what the federal government has been able to do, but it still gets all the way down to a personal level and how politics is local and how we deal with each other at the local level. Until we can really begin to do that, I think we're always gonna have this issue.*

### **Proposals to Change Professional DMC Requirements**

When asked to propose changes to DMC requirements in their workplaces, only a few of those KIs not more directly involved with DMC prevention had concrete responses.

Nevertheless, a police officer suggested:

*I would have the training mandated at the academy for the officers and as an in-service training for the officers every year to keep updated on it because we don't really have it now.*

A probation officer referred to data sharing:

*I think it would be very beneficial for us to take what informal discussions amongst our personnel, and make it a formal part of our training. And not just the initial training that new officers receive, but that it becomes a continuing part of*

*refresher training. And I think it's important for our staff - they really don't get to see the data like their counterparts. So I think that's another thing that we should probably be doing. And I think it would help them to understand better the trends and what's effective and what's not and why some of the changes - they probably wonder some of the decisions that are made and the edicts that come out, well why are we doing that? Probably to do a better job of sharing the data so that they understand what's behind the change or the decisions that are made. It gave us the confidence that, well, this isn't a probation driven thing. This is DMC driven, and this is a group consensus that we need to be doing this.*

A state's attorney addressed DMC leadership:

*First of all, I would have a program that was run by somebody who knew what they were doing, had the sensitivities, and was African-American and I would not tolerate them saying, "Oh, yeah. Anybody can do this as long as they have the heart for it." Excuse me, that is not the case. I would have an African-American running a program of training and you would not be able to work in this office unless you were trained and you did understand the goal of that program.*

The issue of cultural competency/sensitivity was implicitly raised by a KI in reference to an interaction with a colleague:

*I told him I said none of you all have ever been stopped driving while black. I have. It's a different type of experience than when you get stopped for a traffic violation, but that's my experience. So we have those kinds of conversations, so **if we could have training with the guards and the probation officer and the parole officers about this whole issue of humanity, I think it would begin to change things.***

### **Promoting an Agency Culture of DMC Prevention**

KIs were asked how the prevention of DMC could become more of a culture and less of a requirement, whether in their agency or the juvenile justice system at large. In contrast to the limited number of responses regarding DMC prevention requirements, many KIs offered suggestions for the promotion of a culture of DMC prevention. Nevertheless, many responses referred to either training or other requirements, reinforcing some of the points made in response to those questions (see above). Some responses referred to community involvement in DMC prevention, an emerging theme that will be addressed in the following section.

In spite of the skepticism and negativity displayed in relation to the acceptance and practice of DMC efforts, many of these responses reflect a belief in the general potential of DMC prevention, given appropriate strategies and cooperation at multiple levels. Many of the respondents feel that DMC can be addressed to some degree within the juvenile justice system regardless of societal conditions.

Police KI responses to the problem of creating a "culture of DMC" include the following:

*I think that the way to do it is to sensitize participants in the criminal justice system, including police officers, of the magnitude of their decisions in dealing with young people. I think that if we make it a viable alternative to something other than arrest, for instance, our restorative justice models.*

*I feel that if we start doing more restorative justice practices in relationship with public school systems, for example mentoring programs involving police officers ...*

*Well I think that it should be just training about an awareness of options that are out there and are, "This is what happens within the juvenile justice system." So cops understand that and they understand what alternatives are available.*

*For these initial responses, make it into another tool that's part of your toolbox to deal with these situations - how they could benefit with a different set of skills - it would be better accepted rather than monitoring how many minority kids are being arrested.*

Detention and Probation professionals responded in the following ways, including references to data analysis and better legal representation:

*I think continuing to have the information out there and the statistics that are showing this, that it is an issue. And being able to break down the areas that it seems to be a problem.*

*I think just making all the agencies in the juvenile justice system aware of it. I know on probation we've had a chance to go to trainings and breakout sessions on it and I think a lot of times law enforcement aren't trained on things like that.*

*I think, first of all, recognizing that there are disparities when kids can get private attorneys and have the money to do certain things in the system. So funding so that equal representation is available, regardless of what their financial ability is, would be a big step.*

Professionals working in adjudication offered these remarks, several emphasizing broad acculturation and socialization issues for juvenile justice professionals:

*I think it takes everybody who's involved at the table all the time to be honest and to look at the picture the way it really is and work to change that and you have to start with the police officers that are hired. You have to start with their training and you have to get rid of the ones that don't want to submit to a culture of fairness and equality and that's hard to do because you've got that ingrained system that's been there for a long time and it's hard to get rid of those people because, hey, they've been there. They're entrenched. Until you're ready to do that, you're always going to have what you always had. And there are few people that are willing to do that; most of them are not.*

*When adults in authority overstep their bounds and agitate young people, you shouldn't arrest them for cursing at the police officer, you shouldn't arrest them for looking cross-eyed at the police officer; those are the kind of things that happen. Then they trump up some charges and you've got a disorderly conduct or you've got this; so it's just a massive, just infusion of training and education and practice and holding people accountable, and it's a continuing practice. It's like anything else, it's like learning a new habit or a skill. You don't get one dose of it and say I've had my shot and I'm good for 10 years, you have to have a continuous inoculation and booster shot. It's a long process, but it's a process well worthwhile. It takes time and effort and accountability.*

*... but I just think they're wiping out all of these services and diversion programs, and all these things now that help kids stay out of trouble. And I think there needs to be more of that.*

*I frankly think that there needs to be more education on DMC and evidence based practices and what works and you know the research showing why you don't suck kids into the system. Because we have a lot of probation officers and assistant state's attorneys and judges who feel that you know the best way to handle kids who misbehave is to suck them into the system.*

Finally, a KI stated the following, including a reference to leadership by example:

*I think that has to be in a number of veins. One is that people from the top have to make this a part of their language, their discourse. The way that they talk to the people who work for them, that's one thing. The other thing is that it has to be made a priority in a number of ways that people need to see it as part of ... it has to be weaved into how the means by which people get evaluated, it has to become part of the evaluation process. Are you in your job to the extent that you have any responsibility or any general authority or impact here; **how are you doing your job in a way that helps us achieve these goals?***

### **Emerging Theme: Importance of Community-level Involvement in DMC Prevention**

The vital importance of community involvement in DMC prevention is an emerging theme in the comments of KIs in considering the components of successful efforts. These comments come from all professional sectors, and refer to active involvement at a strategic and organizational level, beyond simply general approval from the broad population.

In this vein, a police officer commented:

*City efforts at this - the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, the mayor's Summer Employment Plan, the Mayor's Task Force on Youth are all geared to reducing the probability that young men and women, especially minority young men and women, being pulled into the criminal justice system. So it's not only a police effort, it is a number of efforts underway citywide to address this very pressing*

*concern that the city has that somehow minority youth are poorly treated or not equitably treated in any of the city or county systems.*

A probation officer stated:

*Community involvement in the decision making process as a collaborative partner, not necessarily as an ancillary or secondary consideration to examination ... there is something to be said about community level support for the youth in those particular communities. It would appear that the Juvenile Justice System is the de facto support system for African American and Latino youth, where private partnerships, private opportunities are the source of support for the white minors who experience many of the same behavioral challenges as the African American and Latino youth.*

A judge remarked:

*Well, I came back and met with our probation office and we started sort of a little project, we call it Minority Youth Outreach Program. We met with four pretty high profile African American ministers and a couple of other high profile, recognized African American leaders in the community. We kind of brainstormed about what we could do to begin addressing this issue.*

Finally, the following comments are from other KIs that also address community participation:

*Our local community, the Juvenile Justice Council, we have the state's attorney on board, we have the judges on board, community organizations, not for profit organizations, so we do have a close knit community that is concerned about our young people. It is. I think my focus, we just - in \_\_\_\_\_ County we had - we were so balanced and we were so focused on the goal, reducing DMC, my main focus I will say was the community, getting the community involved, churches, youth groups, getting the community involved to help because my experience is hands on. If you can get and it may take one child at a time, if you can get them a mentor or help them work things out you don't have to get arrested, you won't even get yourself involved in this type of issue. I guess that's because I've been on all different type of ends of it the spectrum.*

*But there also has to be other stakeholders, advocates, community folks, parents, maybe youth activists. But other folks who are watching, who are helping push that ... move that work along, but who are also holding people accountable who do have the yes or the no power. Both of those things are important, and I definitely learned that in the DMC training and then doing this work; you have to have all those stakeholders doing their part.*

### **3. Juvenile Justice Policies and Procedures**

#### **Use of Discretion at OJJDP Decision Points**

This section addresses policies and procedures in the juvenile justice system as experienced and perceived by respondents; the practice of discretion along the various decision points; the perceived appropriateness of such discretion; methods of data collection pertaining to race and ethnicity of juvenile suspects; tools used for assessment and evaluation along the decision points; and the use of culturally sensitive services and restorative justice remedies.

Among police SRs, there was widespread estimation of “a good bit” of discretion at initial, police-involved decision points; such estimations regarding police discretion among police are somewhat higher than among their colleagues in court services and adjudication. At the same time, police less commonly view those working at later decision points as having “a good bit” of discretion, whereas their colleagues working at those decision points tend to perceive a high level of discretion for themselves, especially at detention hearing, delinquency petition, adjudication hearing, probation, and sentencing hearing. Thus the data reveal less awareness of the use of discretion at those decision points in which juvenile justice professionals do not participate or experience.

**Table 16: SRs Perceptions of Decision Point discretion by profession  
D=Court Services J=Adjudication P=Police**

SR - At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?	None			A Little			A Good Bit			Don't Know		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
Initial police contact	27%	9%	5%	10%	7%	18%	53%	67%	73%	10%	16%	4%
Station Adjustment	27%	9%	5%	13%	14%	19%	47%	58%	71%	13%	19%	5%
Arrest	24%	8%	5%	23%	20%	34%	41%	60%	57%	12%	13%	4%
Transfer decision to Adult Court	26%	14%	16%	29%	23%	31%	36%	56%	24%	9%	7%	29%
Detention Hearing	8%	2%	11%	38%	33%	30%	53%	60%	24%	1%	5%	36%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	22%	12%	12%	41%	37%	24%	20%	21%	17%	18%	30%	47%
Delinquency	15%	2%	8%	29%	29%	29%	48%	61%	26%	8%	7%	37%

Petition				%	%	%	%		%			%
Adjudication Hearing	15%	7%	10%	32%	33%	28%	47%	52%	22%	6%	7%	40%
Probation	1%	0%	9%	28%	29%	25%	70%	67%	28%	1%	5%	38%
Sentencing Hearing	1%	5%	9%	37%	31%	26%	57%	62%	26%	5%	2%	39%
Staff in a juvenile justice facility	5%	7%	9%	35%	19%	21%	29%	19%	18%	31%	56%	51%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	13%	5%	9%	26%	21%	21%	21%	21%	20%	41%	53%	51%

Among KIs, however, there were several police officers who perceived *less* discretion for themselves and *more* for those professionals working later in the process:

*I think the most discretion occurs post-arrest, and let me say it this way, many times, especially dealing with juveniles, the decision is not always the officer's alone to arrest. There's usually victims involved and they have a say in what happens next.... And then I think the bulk of the decisions come at the state attorney's level.*

A police KI more pointedly sees:

*... the state's attorney's office as the "invisible dictator" of criminal justice. He decides what becomes of police work, and nobody can appeal or do anything about his decision unless they have pretty solid grounds to alleged criminal corruption. And, otherwise, the state's attorney is free to do as he pleases.*

A KI noted the limits of police discretion:

*We have to take steps - they are very well outlined. It's not something that we can pick and choose from. So, the system is set but I think it would be beneficial for a little more allowance in discretion - but a lot of that doesn't matter when you have a victim and when you have a limited set of tools. If you have not been trained in juvenile delinquency response, an officer's ability to respond otherwise is very limited.*

Conversely, a state's attorney KI emphasized the discretion of police in relation to prosecutors:

*I think whatever the police want them to do, they do. I've literally seen police reports where the police officer has said, "Well, we know it's your discretion, but this is what we think." You're going to be working with that person all the time.*

Whereas a probation officer perceives discretion at many points in the system, but especially at that of detention:

*Each decision point permits for a certain level of discretion. If I could point to any decision point where discretion is least likely to occur, I would certainly say at the detention decision point because we have done so much work up front of identifying minors who are most appropriate for hold of custody, versus minors who are most appropriate for return home pending a court appearance. And so, because that is one decision point where we have been so intentional as a system, there is certainly much more work to do with the other eight decision points to be as intentional, and putting in place objective measures.*

From both SR and KI data, it's clear that many or most juvenile justice professionals have a basic awareness of the relatively wide use of discretion throughout the system. Police officers, however, often claim to have little knowledge of customary behavior at other major decision points. There is however a sizable minority among court services SRs that perceives—apparently inaccurately—little allowance for discretion in the system prior to adjudication.

These contradictory perspectives may reveal in some cases the absence of broadly informed and common professional culture pertaining to the purposeful employment of discretion at various points in that process. Such perspectives may also indicate cultural or procedural variations among local jurisdictions and social contexts. In either case, a more accurate awareness of discretion and its appropriate uses of discretion throughout the system would serve to clarify the roles of juvenile justice professionals in working to both prevent and reduce DMC.

### **Perceptions of the Use and Abuse of Discretion**

The goals of DMC prevention depend on the appropriate use of discretion throughout the system. The use of discretion may be limited in many cases by the underlying crime, the youth's history, evaluation tools and results, and legal requirements. Appropriate discretion may be dependent upon the availability of diversion and/or treatment programs in the community, and on the juvenile's parental support for such interventions.

In addition, what might be perceived as the inappropriate use of discretion, especially when related to race or ethnicity, may discredit the idea that it can be implemented fairly, consistently, and responsively in a variety of juvenile justice cases. Thus DMC prevention efforts depend on effective training methods and the development of a culture of professional judgment. In many cases, KIs demonstrate a level of awareness that can be seen as the basis for a culture that is more consistently responsive to DMC prevention efforts.

Comments from a number of KIs in a variety of professional roles demonstrate various elements of such awareness relating to both the appropriate use and potential misuse of discretion. Comments supportive of appropriate, broad discretion include:

*I prefer some latitude and discretion involved in decisions. There's people that are gonna feel the decision's not fair, but on the whole I'm willing to take that criticism if, in fact, the decisions benefit the child long-term. Also, there's a benefit to the community long-term if we do everything we can do to get this straightened out and marshal all the resources we can to attempt to address that issue.*

*If there's a victim that wants to pursue a crime you have to make an arrest. That's something if they're being disorderly or a victimless crime, then really it depends on the child's background. Are they involved in the community? Are they just being silly and making a mistake and being a kid? Are they respectful? Are they polite? Have they been in trouble with the police before? Really, it's sort of how they act at the time.*

*I think the juvenile judges should have more discretion. That's legislative and so you know we don't always control that. I believe discretion is appropriate when applied purposefully, and so discretion on a case by case basis is certainly appropriate because it - there is no cookie cutter method to improving the quality of life for each child on a case by case basis.*

*But I think that it is appropriate, and we actually have, and have had a court liaison even when I began. When I had my first exposure, we had one in place, and so that person is able to consult with the judge, and the state's attorney, and can get whatever - recommend whatever support, including evaluation, and so they're able to help in the disposition, which I think is a benefit to young, or to our juveniles.*

*Well, I think because it's a case-by-case basis and at the time the juveniles are represented by an attorney and I know, especially locally, the judges take the time to really look at the whole entire situation and not just at the offense. They may have information regarding the youth particulars, their history, their families and our local judges take a lot of time and concern before they just hand out adjudication or a sentencing.*

*One of first things that we did was put into the process that before a violation can be filed, the case needed to be staffed with the officer's direct supervisor. And in order to help probation officers understand what we were looking for before a supervisor would sign off on a violation, we had a lot of training to do. We had a lot of case management, what kinds of services were provided to the youth, what did the probation officer do to support or motivate a youth or help bridge some of the gaps that resulted in the behavior.*

The following comments suggest that discretion may be used inappropriately, including in ways that directly affect DMC:

*The challenge that we have with the practice of - with discretionary practices is when discretion benefits any particular demographic more than it benefits the whole.*

*If you look at the color of the kids that are in there, more of them are misused than have benefited from the discretion. It goes all the way from the police, because the police officer does have the opportunity to really look at the circumstances and make a different decision on behalf of the kid and even talk to people who want to press the charges, "Do you really want to do this?"*

*And I - there is some indication that discretionary practices have contributed to the over representation of African American children and disparities that are affecting all racial and ethnic minority populations.*

*But at the same time, when discretion is put in the hands of people that don't even understand constitutional rights and what people are doing, or put in the hands of people that might have some racial biases or whatever, it can definitely be a very negative force.*

*You know part of the reason you get inappropriate discretion is because that police officers, too, feel that the Criminal Justice System is broken. So in a lot of cases cops are struggling with I'm gonna go through three hours of paperwork to have the state's attorney screen the case out, because she's overloaded with work or because the judge doesn't want to see too many cases today? So there's those kind of challenges, too.*

*So the last nine weeks have been hellacious for my kids because there's just been a series of state's attorney's coming in and out, who each have their own take on how this should work. Or what model we should be using, and what kind of agreements we should be making, and what they'll let my kid admit to, and what they won't, so - it's the culture.*

These comments indicate that among juvenile justice professionals there is some basis for concluding that the inappropriate use of discretion can result in DMC, and that the appropriate use of discretion is necessary to best meet the needs of the young people involved in the system. Policymakers need, however, to emphasize the specific connection between the appropriate use of discretion and DMC prevention.

## **Data Collection**

The following tables display survey responses to questions pertaining to juvenile justice policies and procedures. Tables 17 and 18 indicate that most juvenile justice practitioners use multiple ways of determining the age, ethnicity and race of the juvenile when they interact with them. The responses to the "Other" category for these two questions did at times indicate some

confusion on the practitioner’s part regarding how they should collect this data; but for the majority of responses, respondents were collecting this information in appropriate ways. The list of “Other” responses can be found in Section 4, Survey Data Tables; first data tables grouping Overall *Frequency Analysis of Responses – All Data Combined*.

**Table 17: How SRs typically determine the age of the offender**

<b>SR - How do you typically determine the age of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)</b>	
I ask them their age	75%
I look at their driver’s license and determine their age	46%
I look them up on my computer	28%
Other	10%

**Table 18: How SRs typically determine the ethnicity/race of the offender**

<b>SR - How do you typically determine the ethnicity/race of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)</b>	
I ask them their ethnicity/race	40%
I look at their driver’s license and determine their ethnicity/race	34%
I look them up on my computer	14%
Other	32%

**Table 19: Whether SRs report the ethnicity/race of the juvenile?**

<b>SR- Do you report the ethnicity/race of the juvenile?</b>	<b>N = 627</b>
Yes	69%
No	22%
Don’t Know	9%

One critical comment made by a KI is relevant to SR tables 17 and 18:

*The law says a subjective determination of race by the officer. Well to me that is absolutely preposterous. Imagine yourself in a car behind another car. When you elect to make a traffic stop how can you tell what the race of the person is at the time you initiate that stop? You can only make a subjective determination when you walk up on that car and look at that person face to face and then it's not an accurate - it's what the guy thinks, the officer thinks.*

**Table 20: Documented DMC Policies and Procedures**

SR - Does your agency have any policy and procedures documentation that addresses DMC?	Yes	No	Don't Know
N = 645	12%	52%	35%

Table 20 shows that **only 12%** (of the 645 survey respondents that answered this question) answered “Yes” when asked whether their agency had any policy and procedures documentation on DMC; 52% responded “No,” while 35% responded “Don’t Know.”

**Table 21: Are DMC Policies and Procedures Followed?**

SR - Are the DMC policies and procedures followed within your agency?	Completel y	Some	Not at All	Don't Know
N = 519	11%	8%	15%	67%

Tables 20 and 21 address whether DMC policies and procedures that are available are followed within their agencies; the responses clearly show a lack of DMC knowledge, and little to no enforcement of DMC reduction policies or practices. The results of the survey are consistent with interview responses from KIs; i.e., not enough information is available on DMC throughout various levels of juvenile justice agencies.

According to one KI,

*There were two areas where we indicated to the commission that we wanted to concentrate our efforts ... we also indicated a need to improve our record keeping and increasing our ability, our information technology capacity to do a better job of tracking and collecting data, and using data effectively.*

### Tools Employed at Various Decision Points

**Table 22: Meetings/Trainings Addressing Evidence-Based Practices**

Have you ever participated in meetings or	Yes	No	Not applicable
---	-----	----	----------------

trainings on juvenile offenders that addressed the following Evidence-based practices?			to my position
Standardized risk and assessment tools	36%	42%	22%
Clinical needs assessment tools	26%	49%	26%
Standardized detention admission tools	30%	46%	24%
Culturally sensitive offender services	27%	51%	22%
Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)	32%	46%	22%
Zero tolerance in schools	40%	42%	18%
Any other?	5%	70%	25%

KIs were asked, when applicable, whether their agency uses standardized risk assessment tools, clinical assessment tools, standardized detention admission tools, culturally sensitive services, and balanced and restorative justice (BARJ) methods.

KI responses reveal that:

- Standardized risk assessments (usually YASI) are commonly used in the processing of juvenile justice cases, including in DJJ settings.
- The majority of KIs other than police, including DJJ KIs, are aware of the use of clinical assessment tools at some point in the processing of juveniles.
- Standardized detention admission tools are mandated and used, although the original instrument may have been modified in various detention centers.
- Culturally sensitive services are not widely used or even widely understood, although cultural sensitivity is promoted among police officers as an aspect of training, especially in Chicago and Cook County.
- KI are commonly aware of BARJ methods, and they are widely used in applicable circumstances, although there may be limitations in resources devoted to such remedies.

In addition, a judge commented:

*I work with the agencies. A lot of that goes through the probation department. What we generally do when we make a determination of what we're going to do with a juvenile the state's attorney, the public defender and myself we all talk in conjunction to try to find out what is the best thing we can do for these kids, and we work in conjunction with the probation. Because our main concern is to try and keep these kids in the community and keep them from coming back.*

This illustrates the importance of the collaborative use of multiple tools at crucial decision points in the juvenile justice process.

#### 4. Behavioral Norms for the Treatment of Juveniles

This section addresses KI perceptions of behavioral norms and culture regarding the treatment of juveniles. KIs were asked to comment on their perceptions of the culture for the treatment of juveniles in their department, on the equal treatment of juveniles in the larger system, and on the nature of their own interactions with youth.

KI comments indicate predictable normative differences among stages of the juvenile justice decision making process. Two comments from police KIs are illustrative:

*I think the culture is not the preventive approach. And I don't think it's in the discretion approach either. So I feel there's more like in the suppression approach.*

*I think probably the system would function a lot better if there was more knowledge of the tools - for officers to deliver a more insightful response. But, parameters are pretty much set, but not up to the officer's discretion. We have to take steps - they are very well outlined. It's not something that we can pick and choose from.*

While a probation official remarked:

*I believe that we have a culture of support for children, and I believe that with access to opportunity, children can correct the behavior that brought them to our attention. And I believe that we are beginning to develop the sort of collective ideology that detention, or incarceration is not the method to realize the type of behavior change that we believe is possible in these children.*

And a judge commented:

*So, I want kids to know that they are valued, that even at a young age they ought to be able to make some basic decisions about right and wrong, I understand impulsivity. So, I don't expect perfection but I expect some improvement. I want them to know that this is a concerted effort that everyone should care about children, and children are malleable and moldable and so are adults, but more so children; brains are still developing all that kind of stuff.*

These approaches to the treatment of juveniles do not necessarily determine the attitudes of all those working within a given department or agency; they do, however, create systemic tensions regarding the treatment of juveniles for all those involved. Probation officers stated:

*We try to stay separate. We don't want the community to view us as the police because then they will become very resistant with us.*

*They say probation is like half law enforcement and half social work. I would probably say that our department is more social work oriented.*

In addition, the practice of zero tolerance in schools has exacerbated these systemic tensions. A detention officer commented:

*Schools don't deal with their behavior problems like they used to. Now they have a cop go in, and when there's a fight, a police officer's brought in, and somebody gets charged. And they try to get him into detention or charges are filed, whereas in the past, a fight's broken up, the kids are sent home. They might be suspended or expelled or whatever the consequence may be, but here, they're in the juvenile court. They're being charged with bringing a couple of joints to school today. And I'm not saying - again, I go back to having kids being held accountable. But we have a lot of kids brought into the system on stuff that years ago would've been laughed at. The school would've dealt with it on its own. But you put police in there, and that's what tends to happen. Police reports get filed, and charges get filed. And I think schools should be safe, believe me. I don't want any kid in a school that's unsafe. So I'm not saying that schools should be lax in the way that they deal with infractions and law-breaking behavior. I'm not saying that. **I'm just saying that putting cops in a school, there's an outcome to that.***

While locating police officers in schools has likely contributed to the criminalization of school discipline problems, it's important to note that this is not universally the case, and that there are a variety of approaches to an officer's role in schools.

*At the high school I think it is that we'll assess and make decisions based on a wide variety of factors, which I think allows us to take an objective look at really what the issues are that are going on with individual kids.*

It should be emphasized that KIs representing all decision points left a general impression of awareness of and respect for developmentally-appropriate treatment, as reflected in three comments from police KIs:

*My role as a juvenile officer, my main goal is to try to get this kid back on track - to get him on track or back on track and work with the parents to keep this boy or girl out of the system.*

*We did a mentoring program in \_\_\_\_\_ High School in \_\_\_\_\_ where there were reductions in violence after six months of starting that mentoring program with 25 youth that were identified as students that have behavior issues and pushers and shakers if you will. And after a year in the program there was a reduction in juvenile arrests as well. So we like to think that we were targeting the right individuals. So I feel that as a nation, we ought to be looking at those approaches at a nationwide level.*

*I feel that as a society we have failed to give them proper options and the proper resources to youth to really give them the tools to renew their minds and to make*

*a different decision. And I see this personally, too, coming to court supporting a youth, for example, in a mentoring program.*

Similarly, a state's attorney commented:

***We want to give young people the opportunity to take responsibility for their behavior; to learn from their decisions; to make things right; and to move forward.*** *And so we've been very involved and supportive in creating diversion programs and bringing counseling programming to the county and the community. But then at the same time, we have equally important responsibility to the victims and the law-abiding citizens and the community as a whole, and so we're going to hold offenders, whether they're juveniles or adults, responsible for their behavior, particularly when it involves crimes of serious violence.*

Among KIs, **the majority feel that juveniles are by and large treated equally or fairly**; they also feel that interactions are respectful for the most part, and that decisions based on those interactions are appropriate. Nevertheless, comments in response to these and other questions also reveal a variety of views regarding contextual factors influencing the treatment of juveniles that are relevant to KI explanations of the unequal treatment that contributes to DMC; and relevant to policymakers concerned about raising awareness of the role of the juvenile justice system in exacerbating or preventing DMC. These views will be considered in the next section.

## **5. Factors Influencing the Treatment of Juveniles- Explaining DMC**

This section reveals KIs' explanations of DMC. Some of the themes emerging out of these explanations are: socio-economic status, family circumstances; mental health support; issues related to zero tolerance in schools and/or gang activity; systemic issues related to juvenile justice decision points; and general issues surrounding race and culture.

According to the survey responses, juvenile justice personnel are unlikely to emphasize factors of race/ethnicity when discussing the fair treatment of juveniles within the system. They are much more likely to attribute some importance to socio-economic and family factors and even general demeanor and personal appearance, than they are to discrimination on the basis of race/ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation. **Ultimately, they ascribe the most importance to juveniles' behavior**—past and present—as well as attitudes and behavior of parents. The following three SR tables illustrate these observations:

**Table 23: Perceptions of Fairness of Juvenile Justice System**

<b>In my community...</b>	<b>Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
The juvenile court is too lenient	76%	4%	20%
Youth are arrested for many things that should be handled by their parents	58%	3%	39%
Police are tougher on people of color (non-whites)	16%	8%	76%
Police tend to treat poor people and rich people differently	36%	7%	58%
People with high income get better legal advice and representation than people with low income	76%	9%	15%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be arrested by police, even for similar behavior	23%	8%	69%
The juvenile court is too punitive	16%	19%	65%
Juvenile courts need to employ more people of color	15%	54%	30%
The court treats native English speakers better than people with little or no English	13%	32%	55%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be transferred to adult court, even for similar charges	10%	31%	60%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be adjudicated in court, even for similar charges.	14%	28%	58%
People of color are reluctant to stand up for their legal rights in court	14%	26%	60%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be prosecuted by the justice system, even for similar charges	14%	19%	67%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be confined by the justice system, even for similar charges	19%	22%	59%

**Table 24: Various forms of discrimination against youth in the juvenile justice system**

<b>Have you seen any discrimination against youth in the juvenile justice system that involved the juvenile's...</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Ability to speak English	8%	92%
Access to social services	8%	92%
Age	9%	91%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	14%	86%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	22%	78%
Family connections	30%	70%

Family living situation	20%	80%
Gang affiliation	28%	72%
Gender	10%	90%
General demeanor and appearance	25%	75%
History of violent behavior	31%	69%
Intelligence	12%	88%
Local culture	11%	89%
Mental health issues	22%	78%
Record of prior offenses	31%	69%
Parent's attitudes	27%	73%
Parent's involvement	28%	72%
Religion	2%	98%
Sexual Orientation	5%	95%
Socio-economic status	17%	83%

**Table 25: Factors that influence decisions in the handling of juveniles**

<b>The way juveniles are handled by the justice system is influenced by the juvenile's...</b>	<b>Grouping Category</b>	<b>Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
Ability to speak English	Place	28%	20%	52%
Access to social services	Place	43%	21%	35%
Age	Demo	67%	10%	23%
Community's attitudes towards youth	Place	50%	16%	34%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	Place	30%	14%	56%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	Behavioral	81%	4%	14%
Family connections	Family	60%	13%	27%
Family living situation	Family	61%	13%	26%
Gang affiliation	History	82%	8%	10%
Gender	Demo/Behavioral	27%	19%	54%
General demeanor and appearance	Behavioral	70%	12%	19%
History of violent behavior	History	90%	4%	6%
Intelligence	Behavioral	45%	19%	37%
Local culture	Place	37%	26%	36%
Mental health issues	Behavioral	75%	10%	15%
Record of prior offenses	History	89%	3%	7%
Parent's attitudes	Family	74%	11%	16%
Parent's involvement	Family	79%	9%	12%
Religion	Family	7%	19%	74%
Sexual Orientation	Stereotypes	10%	19%	71%
Socio-economic status	Place	33%	15%	51%
Stereotypes	Stereotypes	26%	21%	53%
Success in school	Family/Place	58%	15%	27%

The above table reflects SRs answers to the question “The way juveniles are handled by the justice system is influenced by the juvenile’s...” By breaking down the data into additional categories (Grouping Categories) it is easier to discern the rank order of influences that appear to make the most impact on juvenile justice practitioner’s decisions.\*\*

- **Past history**, which includes: Gang Affiliation, History of Violent Behavior and Record of Prior Offenses in the juvenile justice system were the highest influencing factors in the decision-making on how youth are handled/processed.
- **Family/Parents connections**, which include: Family Connections, Family Living Situation, Parent’s Attitudes, and Parent’s Involvement were the second highest influencing factors for the youth’s processing.
- **Behavioral issues**, which include: Drug and/or Alcohol Behavior, General Demeanor and Appearance, Intelligence, and Mental Health Issues were the third highest influencing factors.
- **Place**, which includes: Ability to speak English, Access to Social Services, Community Attitudes towards Youth, Cultural/Ethnic/Racial background, and Local Culture, Socio-Economic Status were the lowest influences in decision-making.

\*\* Note that some items could be grouped in multiple categories.

### **Potential Causes of DMC**

DMC is inextricably related to socio-economic, systemic, and individual factors, all of which have a racial/ethnic component. Those systemic factors that relate to the juvenile justice system in general and OJJDP decision points in particular are central to DMC prevention policies and programs. KI explanations of DMC may connect insights about the workings of the juvenile justice system with a desire and willingness to contribute to reforming the system and promoting DMC prevention. Explanations that emphasize the relatively incorrigible nature of DMC as embedded in socio-economic inequality or racial/ethnic culture and families might indicate less of a willingness to critically reflect on the system and positively engage prevention efforts.

However, the illustrative comments below do not inevitably assign a KI to either category referred to above, but can be seen as indicative of a range of perspectives among KIs that in complex ways may ultimately affect attitudes and behaviors in professional roles. Insight into the larger social determinants surrounding DMC should not be mistaken for an unwillingness to address systemic issues. Overall, these comments highlight the richness and diversity of explanations of DMC, a willingness to address systemic issues in general, and a relative unwillingness of some KIs to engage with systemic and racial issues in juvenile justice.

Ultimately, it is the responsibility of researchers and policymakers to clarify and critique such explanations on the basis of data and analysis, and to communicate their findings to juvenile justice professionals in ways that make DMC prevention policies and procedures at key OJJDP decision points more understandable and thus, more supportable. Such relevant research perspectives are included below.

➤ **Socio-economic and Familial Factors**

The relationship between poverty, race, and family structure has of course been a staple of sociological research, and is a relevant lens within which to view DMC. Kirk (2008) writes that “disadvantages in the form of unstable family structures explain much of the disparities in arrest across race and ethnicity. At the neighborhood level, black youths tend to reside in areas with both significantly higher levels of concentrated poverty than other youths as well as lower levels of collective efficacy than white youths.” Comments from the following KI reflect this perspective:

*When you look at the psychosocial background of each one of these kids, one is a male and one is a female, one is Latino and one is African American, they didn't have a snowball's chance in hell of making it because of what happened to them as babies and then toddlers and then elementary students and then adolescents. They were both given natural life without parole.*

*So we have a lot of kids who are raising themselves as a result of some problems inside of their households that we and society did not solve. So they're trying to be adults and that leads to a lot of problems; so no I don't get mad at them, no. If I get mad at anything I get mad at myself and the system because we don't have anything in place that can help these kids.*

*I'm not saying that because you're poor that they go out and commit crime. Just like just because you're a person of color doesn't mean you go out and commit crime. It's that there are so many issues compounded. Along with the poverty comes other challenges that a parent may experience, that they're concentrating on ...*

*I think a lot of it is family issues. A lot of these we do have are single-parent families. I just don't think that the youth of today have the same upbringing as we did back in the '80s.*

*Every kid is different, so a lot of it is the way they were brought up. Are the parents in the system? Is this a rite of passage for them? "My dad has been in and out of jail; he's in prison now. My mom's been in and out." What I'm saying is that's what their family does. Their family knows crime - that's how they exist, and you know what, that kid's probably gonna be a career criminal unless something dramatic happens. So we have a lot of kids like that.*

➤ **Mental Health and/or Lack of Parental Support**

The issue of parental support, both socially and financially, was raised on several occasions by KIs in suggesting possible causes for differential juvenile justice decisions. In addition, mental illness and/or substance abuse and the availability of treatment were seen by some as contributing to decisions, with parental support or lack thereof becoming an important factor. Such decisions may also be influenced by the involvement of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) in the life of a juvenile.

However, it's important to add a word of caution regarding the interaction between mental illness and DMC. In one study, Desai et al. (2012) conclude "DMC in these data was not explained by mental illness, seriousness of charges, violence risk, age, or gender. We suggest that mandated efforts to reduce DMC will need to address more than improving behavior or reducing symptoms of mental illness among detained minority youth. Instead, efforts should be focused on reducing the racial disparity evident in decisions made within the juvenile justice system."

The following KI comments refer to these factors:

*I think that our - my kids that are white tend to have more family involvement. Like their parents will actually show up at the court hearings, and those kinds of things. And then they'll tend - so they'll tend to get a different kind of - they'll get different days in remission. For example, if a family shows up and the kid's out of control, you know? Not doing what they're supposed to do on probation, and the judge is going to give them some days in the detention center, he'll tend to give them less than the African-American kid whose parents aren't present in court, and - you know what I'm saying? So I can't ferret out whether that's a difference because of, because you're black or white, or if it's a difference because of perceived ... perceived resources.*

*Juvenile arrests are usually pretty complicated, especially in an area like that I work in now where unfortunately a lot of these kids don't have the parental support. So even when you do have opportunities to give them an easier way to get help, you have to have a parent, of course, to sign off. And that's usually not there in a lot of cases unfortunately.*

*I also see a lot of mental illness in these children that could have been addressed very early if a parent had the wherewithal and knew how to advocate even with the public school system. How do you go and get an individual education plan for a kid that's hyperactive when they're just being told, "Your kid is bad." So it's so multifaceted.*

*I know that a lot of the kids that we have contact with here in the building are Special Ed kids with a wide variety of disabilities. So you know which came first, the chicken or the egg? I mean is it the behavior that created the disability or is it the disability that created the behavior?*

### ➤ **Issues Related to Zero Tolerance in Schools and/or Gang Activity**

KIs who express a view of the role of zero tolerance in the juvenile justice system almost uniformly see it as a negative one. In reference to gang involvement, Tapia (2011) remarked that "The current trend of criminalizing gang membership, absent instant delinquency charges, or outstanding arrest warrants causes the intersection of gangs and race in the earliest stages of DMC to go undiscovered and unaddressed."

*I would say 70 percent of our kids that are coming through probation are gang-involved. It just so happens the gangs are evolving from the poor neighborhoods or where the Housing Authority projects are. I think a lot of these kids come from broken homes and they really turn to the street life and I would imagine that's where the majority of the weapons offenses or the shootings or the robberies have taken place.*

*The heavy population for gangs is the Hispanic and the black - African Americans. I mean there are a few whites involved in the gangs, but it comes down to reasons kids join gangs. A lot of the times it's because their parents are not involved in their life, they're not being provided the necessary things that they need to survive like food, shelter and clothing. They don't feel a sense of attachment and will go to the street life to have that sense of family.*

*More ... they wanted the juvenile judges hanged, and they wanted the juveniles who were causing the burglaries and the gangs and the shootings, they wanted them jailed. ... a hard and punitive attitude.*

*Zero tolerance in schools is part of the \_\_\_\_\_ public school system's method. We have been and continue to be engaged with \_\_\_\_\_ to take another look at those policies and how they affect children, and how that policy drives children into our system. So, it is their policy. It is their practice, but we haven't given up.*

***We put all these police officers in schools, and guess what? We get a lot more kids arrested at schools. Schools don't deal with their behavior problems like they used to. Now they have a cop go in, and when there's a fight, a police officer's brought in, and somebody gets charged.***

### ➤ **Systemic Issues Related to Juvenile Justice Decision Points**

Perceptions by juvenile justice professionals regarding any of the contexts discussed above can influence decision making; when these factors are combined, either explicitly or implicitly, with issues of race and culture (next section), they may contribute to DMC along the various OJJDP decision points in the process, albeit in ways that researchers have found to be complicated. Leiber and Rodriguez (2011) explain, "states and localities will more often focus on the youth themselves or their families, and their conditions, rather than assess how policies within the system may work to disadvantage some groups relative to others."

These comments, however, are evidence of increased awareness of the role of the juvenile justice system in DMC:

*... it starts with the city ... to know that we no longer have a youth department, for instance, and to know that we no longer even have a youth division, a juvenile division within the department ... Juveniles are just not an issue of concern, of major concern, and it should be because those are the kids that we're going to see later that are going to be incarcerated. If you don't have something in place for them at the bottom - I mean they are destined ... I think the city just doesn't,*

*generally speaking, the city does not value that concept at all. And the actions just speak louder than words; the fact that there's no youth department, and we have no juvenile division in a department our size, it speaks volumes.*

*So, if you work in the police department or the state's attorney's office you really become fixated or focused on what power and tools you have to do the job you're trying to do. I guess another way of saying this is that we are in the siloes and forget that we're in these siloes and don't think about ways that we can break through and what's the cost of siloes.*

*And sometimes I think in some counties the culture encourages you to be a certain way. And in some counties, you know, you have a state's attorney who ... who lives and works in that community. And if it's a smaller - especially if it's a smaller county, or a smaller community, they have to live and work with a lot of people that are - potentially have family members who are being arrested. ... But that is not my experience here. And I don't know if it's because it's a bigger community, a bigger county, or what the distinction is.*

*I think our probation officers and on a state level and not just locally here, I think we've really started to accept and even embrace the fact that we are more than just enforcers of court orders or referral agents. We're smart people, and we do have some skills. And we need to use our brains and the skills that we have and not just refer a kid over to mental health because they scored a certain level on YASI. Not saying that our probation officers can or should become counselors, but they can certainly do more than make a referral.*

In referring to survey results in order to further elaborate on systemic explanations of DMC, Table 26 indicates that a majority of SRs feel that most of the discretion within the juvenile justice system occurs at the front end of the system with the initial contact, arrest, and entry points. With the majority of SRs working as police/law enforcement, these responses may be expected. However, some police/law enforcement KIs stated that they did not feel that they had much discretion at all. They indicated that they were bound by the nature of the offense and the victim's involvement when making decisions; there is a common theme that they do not have the discretion in decision making that they would like. Nevertheless, in interviews with KIs other than police, they usually believe that police have most of the discretionary powers in their decisions to introduce youth into the system, a view consistent with SRs:

**Table 26: SRs responses regarding Decision Points and use of discretion**

<b>How much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff at each decision point in the juvenile justice process?</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>A Little</b>	<b>A Good Bit</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
Initial police contact	8%	16%	69%	6%
Station Adjustment	8%	18%	67%	7%
Arrest	8%	31%	55%	6%

Decision to transfer to Adult Court	17%	31%	28%	24%
Detention Hearing	9%	32%	30%	29%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	14%	27%	18%	42%
Delinquency Petition	9%	29%	31%	31%
Adjudication Hearing	10%	29%	27%	33%
Probation	7%	25%	37%	31%
Sentencing Hearing	8%	28%	32%	31%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	9%	23%	20%	48%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	9%	22%	20%	49%

➤ **Issues of Race/Ethnicity and Culture**

Much research attempts to explore the more explicit impact of race/ethnicity and culture on DMC, especially those addressing the issues of race and “stereotype threat.” Leiber et al. (2007) conclude that “... linkages to segregation, family disruption and subcultural adaptations (i.e., shadow cultures, codes of the streets) with social isolation (lack of sustained interaction with individuals and institutions from mainstream society) will most likely continue to develop and foster stereotypes that shape decision makers perceptions of minorities as “threatening” and increase the likelihood of state intervention ...”

The KI comments below more directly address race/ethnicity and culture in relation to DMC:

*It boils down to this - it is race. No one wants to say that because that's politically incorrect. We're supposed to have emerged from that era, so no one wants to say that. It is race because if you look at the socioeconomic positions of people, that within itself also is very much correlated to race. So, how do you divide that up? You can only do that if you're trying desperately not to look at the facts the way they are. It is race.*

*I just figured - here we got kids from different counties. But let's say there's a kid from a southern county, and he's white, and he broke in. Maybe he broke into a garage, so they might just send him home. But if a kid maybe in Chicago, that's black or Hispanic, did the same thing, he might actually get taken in and arrested and charged.*

*The prosecutor...we have pleas on Tuesdays among other days, but that's really when we have the pleas generally Tuesday morning, and the deputy prosecutor would offer a pass to dismiss maybe three or four months to white kids, but you have a black kid who is similarly situated and he didn't offer and I just said I'm not going to accept any more offers because it doesn't make sense to me.*

*We also have a teen court here and we know that - first of all, the people that get referred to teen court - if you look at the number of white youth as opposed to black students that are youth that come through the police department you have*

*to understand that the police have a different attitude towards a young black man than they do a young white man. Now, just being here and seeing how it first happens, who gets arrested, who gets a station adjustment, who gets a petition instead, who gets put into teen court, and who doesn't - a lot of the youth from surrounding area, places that are not inner city, they will get referred to teen court. They will mostly be white. They will have drug issues even more so than the African-American youth that come through and they are usually the ones who get no adjudications.*

*Well, one injustice that I've seen that's just really bothered me over - and it happened seven months ago, but I had a white kid come through. And usually when our kids come through on a serious charge, they're arrested, taken to the detention center, and then they have a detention hearing. So that's very frustrating, because if one of my African-American kids would come through like that, they would have been at the detention center, and they probably would have been detained. So those kinds of things are irritating to me....*

## **6. Conclusions & Recommendations**

### **Conclusions**

The conclusions of this study refer mostly to juvenile justice personnel background, awareness, and perceptions; to training, data collection, and other forms of organizational and agency capacity-building for DMC prevention; and to broader external issues related to schools, communities, and policymakers:

- Issues of demographic representation and cultural competency among juvenile justice professionals retain their relevance to DMC prevention policy in many jurisdictions.
- Structural barriers to addressing proportionate minority representation remain in some agencies/jurisdictions.
- Juvenile justice professionals are increasingly aware of DMC, but less so of the juvenile justice system's contribution to the problem—regardless of the larger social context.
- Juvenile justice professionals have a wide range of explanations for the existence of DMC, but a relatively less common appreciation of the cumulative contribution of various juvenile justice decision points to the problem.
- Juvenile justice professionals perceive little overt racism in the system, and are often unaware of the role of institutionalized racism in the juvenile justice system and in the society.
- While awareness of the uses and misuses of discretion is common among juvenile justice personnel, the relationship between the appropriate use of discretion at various decision points and DMC prevention is less widely understood and appreciated.

- Juvenile justice professionals often do not see the need for general DMC prevention policies; they often have less than positive views of the potential of DMC prevention efforts, even among those who do see the need for such efforts.
- DMC training has not become an institutionalized aspect of professional preparation and ongoing professional development in the field of juvenile justice.
- Training efforts that exist are largely seen as worthwhile, but are also disparate and in many cases do not effect decision making, resulting in a failure to integrate training into professional practice.
- The goal of accurate, thorough, and consistent collection of DMC-related data at all decision points has yet to be achieved.
- Assessment and evaluation tools are widely used, but not always in standardized versions.
- Juvenile justice professionals along all decision points are commonly aware of the developmentally appropriate treatment of juveniles, and of the established goals of the juvenile justice system as ameliorative rather than punitive.
- The roles of diversion and restorative justice in the juvenile justice system are widely understood and appreciated, although they are not as commonly viewed as an integral aspect of DMC prevention.
- Zero tolerance, especially in relation to schools, is often viewed by juvenile justice professionals as unwise and counter-productive in its potential for criminalizing disciplinary responses.
- Those most actively involved in DMC prevention efforts stress the potential benefits from involvement with community-based organizations and coalitions.
- Increased awareness of DMC causes and prevention efforts among juvenile justice professionals, and increased organizational capacity and political support for implementing DMC prevention efforts, are viewed as vital by DMC policymakers.

### **“Promising Practices” Research Background**

While research and practice in DMC does not refer to “best practices” as strictly defined in other areas of prevention, the recommendations that follow from the above conclusions are in many cases aligned with the “promising practices” suggested by Cabaniss et al. (2007). They listed the “common practices and emerging strategies” for effectively lowering DMC rates as:

- Data review and decision-point mapping
- Cultural competency training
- Increasing community-based detention alternatives
- Removing decision-making subjectivity
- Reducing barriers to family involvement

- Cultivating state leadership to legislate system-level change

## **Recommendations**

Finally, the above conclusions based on CPRD findings suggest the following recommendations:

1. Offer and mandate cultural competency and adolescent development education/training for juvenile justice professionals, with an emphasis on their joint relevance to DMC.
2. Offer and mandate DMC training for juvenile justice professionals, with an emphasis on OJJDP decision points and the appropriate uses of discretion.
3. Build consensus and require the use of standardized and race neutral assessment instruments.
4. Build consensus and require the implementation of standardized data collection tools, techniques, and processes to account for race and ethnicity at all relevant OJJDP decision points.
5. Offer state-level technical assistance to promote the implementation of DMC training, assessment tools, and data collection.
6. Advocate at state and local levels for the involvement of community members, organizations, and coalitions in local DMC prevention efforts.
7. Advocate at state and local levels for the diminution or elimination of zero tolerance policies in schools.
8. Advocate for increased availability of resources for alternatives to detention and restorative justice, and increased involvement of families of delinquent youth in these options. Explore options and synergy with other state and local health and services such as DCFS, IDHS, ISBE, IBHE and Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity.
9. Continue state-level technical assistance for the ongoing quantitative and qualitative evaluation of DMC prevention implementation, process outputs, and outcomes
10. Affirm state-level commitment to achievement of compliance with OJJDP guidelines.

# QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority  
March 2013  
Prepared by Erica Hughes, Daniel Lawrence, and  
Christine Devitt-Westley

# The Illinois DMC Assessment

## Quantitative analysis

### Introduction

The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) was commissioned by the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission (IJJC) to perform a quantitative analysis of the status of Juvenile Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) within Illinois. The goal was to measure the nature and extent of disproportionality at a statewide level across nine decision points in the juvenile justice system: arrest, referral for prosecution, diversion, detention, petitions filed, cases adjudicated delinquent, probation, admissions to secure confinement (the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice), and transfers to adult court. The focus year was 2010, the most recent year for which complete local data were available.

DMC refers to an empirical finding across the United States that minority youth are involved in the juvenile justice system at a rate that exceeds their representation in the general population. In 2009, black youth comprised 16 percent of all U.S. youth ages 10 to 17, but 34 percent of youth whose cases were handled in juvenile court.<sup>1</sup> The rate of minority overrepresentation in juvenile justice systems across the country has contributed to greater scrutiny of juvenile justice system decision-making and the examination of how other factors correlate with race, such as poverty, contribute to the over-representation of minorities.

The federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA), amended in 1988, requires each state participating in formula grant programs administered by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to assess the extent of over-representation of confined minority youth. In 1992, Congress expanded the mandate regarding DMC and required states with an over-representation of minorities in the juvenile justice system to develop and implement plans to reduce it. The JJDPA of 2002 broadened the DMC initiative from disproportionate minority confinement to disproportionate minority contact to cover minority youth at all decision points in the juvenile justice system. The DMC assessment reported here is part of Illinois' response to that OJJDP mandate.

OJJDP has identified three reasons to examine disproportionate minority contact in a given location: 1) to describe the extent to which minority youth are over-represented, 2) to describe the nature of that over-representation, and 3) to create a foundation for ongoing measurement of DMC and provide the basis for monitoring activity. In order to do this, data that describes the race/ethnicity of youth in the system need to be gathered and analyzed.

The information provided here does not attempt to describe the reasons for any differences that occur, nor does it develop strategies to reduce those differences. Instead, the purpose of this

---

<sup>1</sup> Puzanchara, C. and Kang, W. (2012). "Easy Access to Juvenile Court Statistics: 1985-2009." Online. Available: <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezajcs/>; Puzanchara, C., Sladky, A. and Kang, W. (2012). "Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2011." Online. Available: <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>

quantitative section is to identify decision points at which juvenile justice process discrepancies occur on a statewide basis, and to create a meaningful foundation for ongoing measurement and monitoring activity. Much of this section describes the relevant DMC data sources available in Illinois, and the methodology used to collect the most accurate information.

Recommendations for the implementation of future DMC measurement and monitoring strategies are also presented.

## **Statewide DMC assessment plan**

Historically, statewide data only existed for three of the nine decision points: arrest, detention and admission to IDJJ. In time for this assessment, one of those data sources, the Illinois Criminal History Record Information (CHRI) System, generated preliminary statewide DMC statistics on two other decision points - referrals for prosecution and transfers to adult court. The remaining four decision points - diversion, petitions filed, cases adjudicated delinquent, and probation - required data collection at the county level, through both electronic data transfers and manual data collection methods (see Appendix 1, Table 1 for data collection instrument).

ICJIA research staff, the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission, and the DMC statewide coordinator developed a DMC assessment plan, based on data availability. The first step of this plan was to identify the appropriate counties for inclusion.

### **Identification of participating counties**

DMC statistics were not included if the minority group's population in any given area was less than one percent. According to the 2010 Census, five counties in Illinois (Scott, Calhoun, Brown, Edwards and Stark) had less than one percent non-White population, and were therefore excluded from the DMC assessment. Of the remaining 97 counties, 60 percent of all minority youth in Illinois lived in one county (Cook) and a cumulative 83 percent of minority youth lived in 5 of Illinois' 102 counties (See Table 1). The remaining 17 percent of the minority youth were spread across 92 geographically dispersed counties.

Further analysis determined that, as of 2010, 98 percent of all minority youth in Illinois lived in 41 of Illinois' 102 counties. This analysis suggested that the appropriate threshold for county inclusion was 5 percent minority youth population. Given the extensive data collection at the county level needed to obtain data for the remaining four decision points, OJJDP agreed that these 41 counties would be the most appropriate targets for the statewide DMC assessment. Appendix 2 presents a map with the percentage of minority youth in each target county and indicates which counties participated in the key informant interviews and on-line surveys. Appendix 3 is a table with the same information.

Table 1 below identifies the 41 target counties. The range of minority youth population across the target counties is vast, spanning from 29 in Pope county, to over 300,000 in Cook County.

**Table 1: County minority youth population, 2010<sup>2</sup>**

<b>County</b>	<b>Minority Youth Population</b>	<b>Percent of county population (5 percent or greater)</b>	<b>Percent of state minority population</b>
Alexander	317	45.25%	0.06 %
St. Clair	12,539	41.48%	2.25 %
Pulaski	239	40.50%	0.04 %
Cook	332,018	38.70%	59.49 %
Peoria	6,507	31.80%	1.17 %
Champaign	4,877	26.38%	0.87 %
Macon	2,911	25.81 %	0.52 %
Jackson	1,183	25.17 %	0.21 %
Kankakee	3,917	22.08 %	0.70 %
Winnebago	10,901	20.90 %	1.95 %
Sangamon	4,288	20.48 %	0.77 %
Vermilion	2,054	19.35 %	0.37 %
Will	30,888	18.33 %	5.53 %
Stephenson	966	17.93 %	0.17 %
Du Page	32,166	17.45 %	5.76 %
Rock Island	4,432	16.49 %	0.79 %
McLean	3,309	15.80 %	0.59 %
Lake	31,745	15.26 %	5.69 %
Madison	4,242	14.33 %	0.76 %
Jefferson	499	12.98 %	0.09 %
Kendall	4,564	12.58 %	0.82 %
Saline	280	12.22 %	0.05 %
Knox	811	12.13 %	0.15 %
Kane	28,563	12.11 %	5.12 %
DeKalb	2,031	10.46 %	0.36 %
Massac	188	10.05 %	0.03 %
McDonough	179	9.18 %	0.03 %
Morgan	381	8.90 %	0.07 %
Marion	369	8.71 %	0.07 %
Randolph	251	7.88 %	0.04 %
Williamson	577	7.28 %	0.10 %
Perry	136	6.98 %	0.02 %
Boone	2,119	6.85 %	0.38 %
Adams	491	6.81 %	0.09 %
Pope	29	6.03 %	0.01 %
Coles	252	5.94 %	0.05 %
Bond	98	5.68 %	0.02 %
McHenry	6,841	5.40 %	1.23 %
Grundy	822	5.37 %	0.15 %
Iroquois	350	5.34 %	0.06 %
Cass	356	5.07 %	0.06 %

<sup>2</sup> Note: These population data were pulled in August of 2011, prior to the U.S. Census Bureau update. Therefore, these numbers are estimates that were generated using 2000 Census data.

<b>Total target counties</b>	539,699		-
<b>Statewide total</b>	558,093		97%

## Identification of data for each decision point

In Illinois, the prosecution of cases, adjudication of cases, and the probation function all operate at the county level. At the present time, there is no statewide data collection system for court and probation data that includes enough demographic and offense information to conduct a thorough assessment. Therefore, time intensive and expansive data collection needed to be conducted in the 41 target counties for these decision points. Hand collecting data from 41 different sources impeded the process of evaluating DMC at the state level.

Finally, the only statewide data for prosecution decisions are those submitted to the state central repository for criminal history records. For a variety of reasons however, reporting of any juvenile disposition information is typically not done. Therefore, there is no statewide system that captures information on the diversion decision point.

The availability of data for each of the nine decision points at the state and county level is summarized below:

### Statewide data systems

Arrest

Detention

Secure confinement

Transfers to adult court

### County Level data systems

Diversion

Referral for prosecution

Petitions filed

Cases adjudicated delinquent

Probation

While every data source has inherent limitations, the data not captured in each system will influence the reliability of the results. For the county level data, in particular, the focus was the probation decision point for most of the data systems used in this analysis. Therefore, information on youth who were diverted before probation or went directly to secure confinement is largely absent. Recommendations for improving data availability at the diversion, referrals to prosecution, petitions filed and cases adjudicated decision points are made later in this report.

The following is a description of each of the data sources used in this DMC assessment. See Appendix 4 for more detail about each system and the data collected at each decision point, as well as information on data limitations.

## Statewide data sources

**Arrest (CHRI data)** - Juvenile arrest data are available on a statewide basis through the Illinois State Police (ISP). That ISP maintain the state central repository for criminal history information in its Computerized Criminal History Record Information (CHRI) System. Finger-print based arrest cards for minors ages 10 through 16 (in the case of a felony offense), or 10 through 17 (in the case of a misdemeanor offense) are submitted to the CHRI System at the time of booking, for the purpose of creating a criminal history for that individual. ICJIA, in cooperation with ISP, has established a computer linkage to the state CHRI system for research purposes. The number of youth arrested in each county was found using this CHRI data source.

There are two important limitations to using CHRI data in a DMC assessment. First, the arrest card does not allow for reporting the youth's ethnicity, only race. Therefore, Hispanic youth who are arrested can be included in any racial category, most often the "White" category. As a result, the most appropriate population figures to use in the DMC calculation at the arrest decision point would include both Hispanic and non-Hispanic white youth as the "White" category.

The second limitation is the fact that the submission of juvenile arrest cards to the CHRI system for misdemeanor offenses are optional on the part of law enforcement, per the state's Criminal Identification Act [20 ILCS 2650/5]. As a result, the true number of juveniles arrested cannot be ascertained from CHRI data. On the other hand, it would not be feasible to collect arrest incident data directly from each of the over 900 law enforcement agencies in the state, leaving the CHRI data as the only option for these data on a statewide basis.

We conducted an examination of the arrest data to determine the extent to which the total number of arrests reported by each county in CHRI was reasonably accurate. The total number of arrests reported in each county was compared to the number of petitions filed in that same county, as reported by a source outside of the CHRI system, the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts Annual Report. Counties reporting more petitions than arrests revealed a possible under-reporting of arrest events in CHRI. Of 102 counties in Illinois, 17 counties (41 percent) reported fewer arrests than petitions.

A second test was conducted to determine the extent to which the total number of arrests reported by each county in CHRI was reasonably accurate. The total number of arrests reported to the CHRI system in each county was compared to the number of arrests filed in that same county, as reported by a source outside of the CHRI system. The analysis found that there were a total of 6,423 arrests made in 2010 as reported by individual counties while there were 28,808 arrests found across the same counties using the CHRI data. Because the data derived from a single source, and only 46 percent of the 41 counties submitted data outside of CHRI for this decision point, the best source of data for the purposes of this project was the CHRI system.

**Detention (Juvenile Monitoring Information System data)** - Detention admissions data were obtained from the Juvenile Monitoring Information System (JMIS). JMIS is a data system that was created and is managed by the Center for Prevention Research and Development at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. It is used by all detention centers in Illinois to input detention data that describe youth and their detention situations. The data reflect youth ages 10 to 16 (although sometimes youth outside that age range are detained), and include various dates (date of admission, date of detention hearing, etc.), demographic information of detainees

(including both race and ethnicity, separately), offense information, average length of stay and average daily population, status offender information and transfers to adult court information. The system is able to generate both case-level data and individual stock reports, which are available by facility, by county, by judicial circuit, and statewide.

While most of the data in the system are reliable and often checked for accuracy, data referencing transfers to adult court data are not considered reliable, because it is not a requirement for entry. As such, these data are only used to gauge activity at the detention decision point and not the transfers to adult court decision point. Detention Centers have the option to enter data directly into JMIS or upload a data file from their individual case management applications that are used in their Detention Center.

Like with arrests, researchers tested the accuracy of the JMIS data system. The total number of detained youth reported to the JMIS system in each county was compared to the number of detained youth filed in that same county, as reported by a source outside of the JMIS system. Researchers found that there were 6,528 youth detained according to the county level data but 7,863 youth detained according to the JMIS data. Though there was a noticeable discrepancy between the sources of data, the data available through the JMIS system were considered more reliable because more counties reported to that system than through their local data (only 27 percent of the 41 targeted counties submitted detention data). Researchers can be more confident in data that obtained from a single system than in data collected from multiple sources employing multiple strategies.

**Admission to secure confinement (Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice data)** - The Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) is the state correctional system for juveniles. As a single state entity, it collects data on juvenile admissions through its Offender Tracking System (OTS). IDJJ has data available on age, gender, race, ethnicity (self reported) and most serious offense for each admission. A distinction can also be made whether the admission is for a new sentence from court, a technical violation of parole, or commitment for a court-ordered evaluation of needs for up to 90 days prior to final adjudication. For the purpose of the DMC assessment, all admission types were included and includes youth ages 13 to 16. While the DJJ data are considered reliable, there is one potential limitation, although it is believed that this does not occur very often: Sometimes admission dates for technical violations are incorrect. What happens in these cases is that a youth is admitted to IDJJ in one year, released in the subsequent year and violates parole, and is then re-admitted for that violation – however the data only reflect a date for that initial admission (not the admission the subsequent year).

An accuracy check was conducted wherein the total number of securely confined youth reported to the OTS system in each county was compared to the number of securely confined youth filed in that same county, as reported by a source outside of the OTS system. Researchers found that there were 224 secure confinements according to the county level data and 749 secure confinements according to the DJJ data obtained through the OTS system. Therefore, the data available through the OTS system were considered more reliable and accurate because more counties reported to that system than through their local data (46 percent of the 41 counties provided DJJ data). Finally, in some counties where there are alternatives to incarceration

available (like Juvenile Redeploy Illinois) it was already decided to use the DJJ as the gold standard for analyzing the effect of alternative programs on incarceration rates.

**Transfers to adult court** - The statewide sources for data on this decision point have changed over the years in Illinois, with data limitations associated with each. Prior to 1999, the Administrative of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) collected and reported on the number of transferred youth, with no other details as to charges or demographics. Collection of this data was discontinued after 1999. A second source used after that was the Juvenile Monitoring Information System (JMIS), which collected information on *detained* youth transferred to criminal court. However, the Cook County Juvenile Temporary Detention Center did not contribute data on transfers into JMIS, and the managers of the JMIS system have warned against using these data because they have been deemed unreliable, as this is optional data to report.

Another source of data for this decision point is the state CHRI data. At the time of arrest, the law enforcement officer should indicate whether the youth was processed as a juvenile, transferred to adult court by a “rule of law”, or transferred “by court order”. The age range for this decision point is more limited than others, since the Illinois transfer laws specify that youth must be at least 15 years old at the time of the alleged offense, but no more than 17 years old (at which time they are considered an adult if charged with a felony offense). The same data fields available for arrest data apply for this decision point – age, race, gender, and offense information. Ethnicity codes (for Hispanic) are not available in CHRI.

Like with arrests and referrals to court, an analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which the total number of transfers to adult court reported by each county in CHRI was reasonably accurate. The total number of transfers reported to the CHRI system in each county was compared to the number of transfers filed in that same county, as reported by a source outside of the CHRI system. The analysis found that, while the numbers were relatively close (95 transfers identified in the CHRI data and 102 identified with the county-level data), the data available through the CHRI system were more accurate because more counties reported transfers to that system than through their local data (Only 22 percent of the 41 target counties provided data for this decision point).

## **County level data**

After identifying the target counties and statewide data sources, the next major task was to identify as many electronic sources of county level data as possible for the remaining decision points - diversion, petitions filed, cases adjudicated delinquent, and probation. The DMC Coordinator, along with other team members, reached out to all the target counties to obtain electronic data files where possible. Any counties without computerized case management information systems would require the final step of manual data collection from paper files. Table 2 presents the final breakdown of electronic vs. manual data acquisition for the 41 target counties. It is important to note that there were cases where data specific to individual decision points may not have been available in one system and that participants had to seek data from other agencies and/or systems.

**Table 2: County level data collection methods and sources**

County	Electronic data transfer or paper reports generated	Manual data collection from case files or other sources
Adams	Tracker	
Alexander		Paper case files
Bond	Tracker	
Boone	JIMS	
Cass	Tracker	
Champaign	JANO	
Coles	JMIS	
Cook	JEMS	
DeKalb	Tracker	
Du Page	Tracker	
Grundy		Paper case files
Iroquois	Tracker	
Jackson	JMIS	
Jefferson	JWatch	
Kane	JANO	Paper case files
Kankakee	Tracker	
Kendall	Tracker	
Knox	Tracker	
Lake	Tracker	
Macon	Tracker	
Madison	Tracker	
Marion		Paper case files
Massac		AOIC Annual Report
McDonough	Tracker	
McHenry	In-house system	
McLean	In-house system	Paper case files
Morgan	Prober	
Peoria	In-house system	
Perry*		Paper case files
Pope		AOIC Annual Report
Pulaski		AOIC Annual Report
Randolph*		Paper case files
Rock Island	Tracker	
Saline		AOIC Annual Report
Sangamon	Tracker	
St. Clair	In-house system	
Stephenson	JMIS	
Vermilion	Tracker	
Will	Tracker	
Williamson	JMIS	Paper case files
Winnebago		Paper case files

**Referral for prosecution**– Along with information on the arrest incident and demographics of the youth, the arrest card used to report events to the CHRI system also contains a field for the

reporting of youth arrest dispositions. While this is not a mandatory field, youth officers can record whether the arrest was “handled within the department” or “referred to authorities”.

Again, an analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which the total number of referrals reported by each county in CHRI was reasonably accurate. The total number of referrals reported to the CHRI system in each county was compared to the number of referrals filed in that same county, as reported by a source outside of the CHRI system. There were a total of 23,863 referrals for prosecution made in 2010 as reported by individual counties while there were only 838 referrals for prosecution found across the same counties using the CHRI data. Researchers decided that the best source of data was available at the local level from individual counties. This finding provided more impetus for conducting an assessment on a statewide level, so that the effect of such data anomalies on the results would be minimized. Data for this decision point came from many different systems across the participating counties; however it appeared more complete than the data available through the CHRI system (61 percent of the 41 targeted counties provided data for this decision point).

**Probation**– Data for this decision point came from many different systems across the participating counties; however 19 of the 41 counties use the “Tracker” case management system. Many counties used their probation management systems or case files to collect the data for more than the probation decision point. For example, many were able to gather referral, petition, adjudication, and diversion data through these systems.

**Diversion**– These data were the most difficult to gather of all decision points. By definition, these are youth who are not typically counted in a juvenile justice database (since they are being diverted away from the system) and many juvenile justice agencies do not keep track of these occurrences in a way that can be tracked easily. Even in those counties where there was a field to collect these data (like the Tracker system), the field was often left blank.

**Filing of petitions**– Data for this decision point typically came from a probation database. However, there were several counties that had to reach out to their local State’s Attorney’s Office to get the data required.

**Adjudication** - Data for this decision point typically came from a probation database. However, there were several counties that had to reach out to their local Circuit Clerk’s Office to get the required information.

# **Statewide DMC Research Methodology**

## **Institutional Review Board approval**

In order to complete this study, researchers received permission from the Criminal Justice Information Authority's Institutional Review Board. Data collected via the Tracker system was case-level but de-identified, and the data from these non-TRACKER counties were received by research staff in either aggregate or in a de-identified case level format that was later aggregated. In the non-Tracker counties, the data were collected by each site for their own operational purposes; at no time were researchers in contact with the youth or their case files. Because, there was never a risk of minors being identified in the final report, the Review Board granted approval for the research.

## **Data collection**

### **1. Tracker counties**

Letters were sent to each chief (or presiding) judge in the targeted counties/circuits from the chair of the Juvenile Justice Commission notifying them of the statewide DMC assessment and identifying that site as a target for participation in the study. Research staff gathered contact information for each of the target sites, beginning with probation departments and circuit clerk offices.

In order to obtain Tracker data, letters were sent from research staff asking permission from Solutions Specialties, Inc. staff to pull case level Tracker data and have it analyzed by ICJIA research staff. In many instances, permission had to be sought from a chief or presiding judge. The letters were used to remind the judges of the assessment and get permission for use. It took approximately 1.5 months for Tracker data from 17 counties to be received for analysis (2 counties that use Tracker submitted aggregated data on their own). Data from all counties that use Tracker were then entered into a SPSS database for analysis (see Appendix 7 for details).

### **2. Non-Tracker counties**

Next, research staff began contacting non-Tracker counties to determine what steps would be necessary for data collection by answering the following questions:

- How are the data housed (automated system or paper files)?
- Are there data for all nine decision points?
- Are data for all decision points available from one system?
- Is the data available in a non-identifiable case level system or in aggregate form?
- Is permission needed to access the data?

The answers to these questions revealed a great deal of inconsistency in data collection methods and, consequently, the contents of county data systems<sup>3</sup>. Because these counties use many different systems, not all counties collect data for every decision point and not all agencies collect data the same way (some, for example, use different race and ethnicity categories). In short, none of the counties did any of the above consistently with each other. Many housed automated systems and many used paper files (including one county that falls into the top 5 in Illinois in terms of population). There was no consistency among counties in terms of who had automated data, who was able to access case-level data, and who was able to provide data for any given decision point.

Once the research team identified the types of systems in place within the targeted non-Tracker counties, members of the team began requesting aggregate data similar in nature to that collected through the Tracker system, in the hopes that the data could be merged across all sites to produce the final statewide DMC estimates required of the project. The data from these counties were received in either aggregate form or in a de-identified case level form that was later aggregated. These data included, at a minimum, information on the number of youth on probation by race. Any other data for the additional eight decision points of interest were also accepted. As data were gathered from these non-Tracker counties, it was cleaned and, when possible, added to the SPSS file that houses the Tracker data.

### **Paper data collection**

Manual data collection was conducted directly from paper probation case files in 9 counties, two of which also provided data from a case management system. The data collection instrument used to collect data in these counties can be found in Appendix 1.

### **Data analysis**

Data analysis began as soon as all Tracker data was in hand and continued as non-Tracker data became available. To determine the RRI of minority groups<sup>4</sup> within Illinois counties, the OJJDP DMC spreadsheet report was obtained at [www.ojjdp.dmcdata.org](http://www.ojjdp.dmcdata.org). This file is capable of calculating the RRIs once counts have been made of youth race groups' contacts across the nine decision points. The report (see Appendix 6) requests the total number of occurrences at each specific decision point of the juvenile justice system tallied for White, Black or African-American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, Pacific Islanders, American Indian, and other/mixed race groups. For this report, only Whites, African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and all minority groups combined are detailed.

---

<sup>3</sup> Please see the results section for more information about these inconsistencies.

<sup>4</sup> This includes African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and other/mixed. Note: Individually, no county in Illinois meets the one percent rule for native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and other/mixed.

The total juvenile population for the corresponding race groups was obtained from OJJDP's website<sup>5</sup>. Populations were calculated for 10 to 16 year olds in each county for calendar year 2010.

Data from counties which used Tracker was supplied in two text files. One text file listed the data in a text format with no values assigned as codes; the other file presented the data based on the value codes<sup>6</sup>. Manual checks were made across these two datasets to determine if any differences existed and none were found. Although no incorrect coding was found across these two datasets, the data file which detailed the data in text format was used when assigning value codes and recoding to ensure the most accurate information in analyses. The Tracker data provides information for the following items: decision point, date of event/decision point, date of birth, race, gender, most serious offense, offense class, and UCR code. The data was very complete across the 17 Tracker counties. Missing and unknown information ranged from 0 percent to 19.74 percent across these variables.<sup>7</sup>

Minor recoding was done. Age at the time of the event was computed by subtracting the date of the event by the individual's date of birth. Cases involving youth younger than 10 and older than 16 were excluded from the dataset. The Tracker data separates out the decision point of petitions into those that were newly filed and those that were violations of earlier petitions. These two decision points were combined to match the OJJDP's nine decision points.

Each county fell into one of three groups. The first group had counties which provided de-identified case level data containing enough information (race, age, and decision point) to create a complete DMC Report. Thirteen of the 22 non-Tracker counties fell into this group. In addition, two counties that use Tracker but decided to submit case level data on their own also submitted aggregate data. While this was the best of the three non-Tracker county groups, it was often found that data across some decision points were missing or not provided. As a result, it is unknown if there were in fact zero cases or if the data were not available. For the purpose of this study, it was assumed that lack of information at a decision point indicated zero cases were recorded. Also, two of these counties did not provide an age variable so it is unknown if the data was of 10 to 16 year olds. And lastly, one county gave both 2009 and 2010 data, but only the 2009 data was sufficient for this analysis.

Group Two was made up of 9 counties which provided researchers with aggregated numbers across races at specific decision points. This information was simply entered into the OJJDP DMC Report. Similar to group one, a lack of reported information at a decision point indicated zero cases were recorded. One county provided total youth across four decision points, but only gave the racial breakdowns for two of those points.

---

<sup>5</sup> [www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop](http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop)

<sup>6</sup> A code book was also provided detailing the value coding.

<sup>7</sup> Total Missing/Unknown Cases: Decision point (0 percent), date of event/decision point (0 percent), date of birth (0.53 percent), race (0.79 percent), gender (0.60 percent), most serious offense (0.004 percent), offense class (8.87 percent), and UCR code (19.74 percent).

Those counties that were in the third group either provided no data or the data that was provided lacked the basic amount information needed to create the DMC Report. There was only one county that made up this third group.

Case level Tracker data from each individual county was entered into one SPSS database for aggregate analysis. When possible, data received at an individual case level from non-Tracker counties was added to the SPSS database (see Appendix 7 for more details). Of the 41 targeted counties, a total of 32 counties provided individual case level data. Cross tabulations of race groups within decision points for each county were conducted to determine the number of observations. A total of 9 counties supplied aggregate race tallies across the decision points. These calculated and supplied totals were then entered in the ODJJP's DMC Report to determine RRIs. As a result, this final state wide DMC report is compiled from 41 individual counties representing 98 percent of the minority population in Illinois<sup>8</sup>.

At the first decision point, juvenile arrests, a total of 46 percent of the 41 counties provided data to ICJIA. Furthermore, 61 percent had the total observations for referrals to juvenile court, 61 percent supplied the number of cases diverted, 27 percent gave the total of cases involving secure detention, 78 percent provided information on the number of petitions filed, 78 percent had information on cases adjudicated as delinquents, 88 percent had data on the number of cases resulting in a probation placement, 46 percent supplied the totals on confinement in a IDJJ facility, and finally, 22 percent listed information of juveniles transferred to adult court. Because these percentages are of the *provided* information across the targeted counties, it does not imply that counties do not collect this information, but that there may have been zero cases in 2010 and therefore the information was not given. For arrest and transfer to adult court data, county totals were pulled from Illinois' Criminal History Records Information (CHRI) database. State information for the total number of confinements within the targeted counties came from the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) database. Finally, detention data was pulled from Illinois' JMIS system, managed by the Center for Prevention Research and Development at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

---

<sup>8</sup> While population estimates for 2010 were used when selecting counties for participation, another analysis was conducted using updated 2010 population data, which found that 98 percent of all minority youth in Illinois live in the targeted 41 counties.

## Results

After aggregating the data, the RRI were calculated for each of the nine decision points in the juvenile justice system for each target county as well as Illinois as a whole. For purposes of this report, only the statewide number is used. There were four target counties that did not require data collection, as it was found that no minority youth had been system involved during calendar year 2010. In those instances, aggregate numbers from annual reports were used and added to the dataset in order to supplement the state data.

Table 3 details the total number of youth within each race group as well as the total youth number and total minority youth number across each of the nine decision points.

**Table 3: Illinois Juvenile Race Tallies within Juvenile Justice Decision Points**

	Total Youth	White	Black or African-American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian	All Minorities
1. Population at risk (age 10 through 16)	1,105,820	566,305	226,062	260,295	50,859	539,515
2. Juvenile Arrests	48,835	20,054	28,192	0	275	28,781
3. Refer to Juvenile Court	29,435	5,492	18,291	5,234	129	23,863
4. Cases Diverted	9,560	2,734	4,281	1,360	53	5,769
5. Cases Involving Secure Detention	9,673	1,826	6,223	1,365	18	7,847
6. Cases Petitioned (Charge Filed)	14,100	2,930	8,236	2,096	52	10,550
7. Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings	4,524	1,835	1,760	763	22	2,645
8. Cases resulting in Probation Placement	9,060	1,964	1,743	699	22	2,584
9. Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	883	134	638	108	0	749
10. Cases Transferred to Adult Court	150	51	99	0	0	99

Meets 1 percent rule for group to be assessed?

**Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes**

The rate of occurrence and RRI are calculated for each of the above race groupings. In line with the national standard for DMC analysis, the White group is left as the reference group and other race groups are compared directly to the tallies of White youth. Relative Rate Indices that are statistically different at the .05 level are marked with an asterisk. Rates could not be calculated for instances in which a race group's total number at a specific decision point is insufficient for analysis. Cases such as this are indicated with a dashed line. Rates were calculated per 1,000 youth, as recommended by OJJDP (see Appendix 1, Table 2).

## Juvenile Arrests

As previously discussed, juvenile arrest data came from the State’s Criminal History Information Records system. This system does not differentiate Hispanics into a separate grouping. As a result, the rate of occurrence and RRI could not be calculated for the Hispanic group.

**Table 4: RRI for Arrests**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate Index						
35.41	124.71	3.52*	0	--	5.41	0.15*	53.35	1.51*
<i>**Base Used: rate per 1,000 youth</i>								

The RRI for the arrest decision point is 1.51, meaning that **minority youth arrest rates were one and a half times that of White youth arrest rates**. In addition, while African-American youth were overrepresented by more than three times that of White youth, Asians were underrepresented in the analysis.

## Referrals to Juvenile Court

**Table 5: RRI for Referrals to Court**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate Index						
27.39	64.88	2.37*	0	--	46.91	1.71*	83.19	3.04*
<i>**Base Used: rate per 100 arrests</i>								

The RRI for the referral decision point is 3.04, meaning that **minority youth referral rates were about three times that of White youth referral rates**. In addition, African-American youth were overrepresented by more than two times that of White youth and Asians were overrepresented by just over one and a half the rate of White youth. There were no data reported for referrals to court for Hispanic youth. These data have their limitations, as they come from many different data sources. Of the 41 counties in the assessment, 25 counties reported data for this decision point.

## Cases Diverted

**Table 6: RRI for Diversion**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate Index						
49.78	23.40	0.47*	25.98	0.52*	41.09	0.83	28.51	0.57*
<i>Base Used: rate per 100 referrals</i>								

The RRI for the referral diversion point is 0.57, meaning that minority youth were underrepresented at this decision point. **All minority populations were less likely to be diverted** out of the juvenile justice system than White youth. These data have serious limitations, as they come from many different data sources. Of the 41 counties in the assessment, 25 counties reported data for this decision point.

## Cases Involving Secure Detention

**Table 7: RRI for Secure Detention**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate Index						
33.25	34.02	1.02	26.08	0.78*	13.95	0.42*	32.77	0.99
<i>Base Used: rate per 100 referrals</i>								

The RRI for the secure detention decision point is 0.99, meaning that minority youth were underrepresented at this decision point. However, 1.00 represents equal representation between minority youth and White youth. It appears **the least amount of over or under-representation occurs at this decision point**. Interestingly, this is the one decision point where a screening instrument is used to determine whether or not a youth will be detained. This suggests that the use of a standardized, validated instrument minimizes the use of discretion at this decision point. These data have few limitations and come from one statewide system so the indices calculated should be considered very reliable. One exception to such reliability is that this RRI depends on the rate of referral to court, which carries its own limitations.

## Cases Petitioned (Charges Filed)

**Table 8: RRI for Petitions Filed**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate Index						
53.35	45.03	0.84*	40.05	0.75*	40.31	0.76*	46.65	0.87*

*Base Used: rate per 100 referrals*

The RRI for the petitions filed decision point is 0.87, meaning that minority youth were underrepresented at this decision point. **All minority populations were less likely to have petitions filed against them than White youth.** These data have their limitations, as they come from many different data sources. Of the 41 counties in the assessment, 32 counties reported data for this decision point.

### Cases Resulting in Adjudications

**Table 9: RRI for Adjudications**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate Index						
62.63	21.37	0.34*	36.40	0.58*	42.31	0.68	24.07	0.38*

*Base Used: rate per 100 youth petitioned*

The RRI for the adjudication decision point is 0.38, meaning that minority youth were underrepresented to a large degree at this decision point. **All minority populations were less likely to be adjudicated delinquent than White youth** and African-American youth were the most underrepresented of all minority groups. These data have their limitations, as they come from many different data sources. Of the 41 counties in the assessment, 32 counties reported data for this decision point.

### Cases resulting in Probation Placement

One county included the number of youth sentenced to probation by race, however that total was much smaller than the total number of youth sentenced to probation as published in AOIC's annual report. As a result, the "All Minorities" RRI was grossly inflated. To fix this issue, that county's total youth sentenced to probation tallied was excluded from the state's totals.

**Table 10: RRI for Probation**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate						

		Index		Index		Index		Index
107.03	99.03	0.93*	91.61	0.86*	100	--	97.62	0.91*
<i>Base Used: rate per 100 youth found delinquent</i>								

The RRI for the probation decision point is 0.91, meaning that minority youth were underrepresented at this decision point. All minority populations were less likely to be placed on probation than White youth. These data have their limitations, as they come from many different data sources. Of the 41 counties in the assessment, 36 counties reported data for this decision point.

### Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities

**Table 11: RRI for Secure Confinement**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate Index						
7.30	36.25	4.96*	14.15	1.94*	0	--	27.85	3.81*
<i>Base Used: rate per 100 youth found delinquent</i>								

The RRI for the secure confinement decision point is 3.814, meaning that minority youth rates were more than three times that of White youth rates. In addition, **African-American youth were overrepresented almost five times that of White youth and Hispanic youth were overrepresented by almost twice the rate of White youth.** There were no data reported for secure confinement of Asian youth. These data have few limitations and come from one statewide system so the indices calculated should be considered very reliable.

### Cases Transferred to Adult Court

**Table 12: RRI for Transfers to Adult Court**

Reference, White	African-American		Hispanic		Asian		All Minorities	
Rate of Occurrence	Rate of Occurrence	Relative Rate Index						
1.74	1.20	0.69*	0	--	0	--	0.89	0.51*
<i>Base Used: rate per 100 youth petitioned</i>								

The RRI for the transfers to adult court decision point is 0.51, meaning that minority youth were underrepresented to a large degree at this decision point. **All minority populations were less likely to be transferred to adult court than White youth.** There were no reports of the transfer of Hispanic or Asian youth to adult court. Although these data have their limitations, they do come from one statewide system so the indices calculated should be considered somewhat reliable.

## **Data Quality - Conclusions and Recommendations**

Efforts to provide a statewide assessment of disproportionate minority contact (DMC) within the Illinois Juvenile Justice system were impeded by large-scale inconsistencies among and within data reporting systems. While conclusions can be drawn about the relative rate of DMC across many Illinois counties, the primary recommendations resulting from the quantitative portion of the DMC assessment involve improvements in data infrastructure to facilitate more consistent and accurate reporting of statistics related to DMC. These findings are echoed in the qualitative portion of the report in which respondents indicate awareness of the system's shortcomings.

The barriers to effective data collection and reporting are detailed in this section, with specific recommendations identified to address each issue.

**Conclusion:** Data submitted for this project came primarily from agency management information systems designed and used for specific administrative purposes that do not include the tracking of juvenile DMC. Further, if agencies are concerned with the racial and ethnic characteristics of individuals under their jurisdiction, it is for different purposes at different decision points (e.g., identification purposes at arrest, language interpreter purposes during court proceedings, etc.). Therefore, race and ethnicity data are not consistently reported across the state (see Appendix 1, Table 3).

**Recommendation:** Require the use of the "Guidelines for Collecting and Recording the Race and Ethnicity Of Youth in Illinois' Juvenile Justice System", developed by the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission and Models for Change, in any update or redesign of the major management information systems identified in this project. Educate IT managers of those systems regarding the importance of their adoption of this standardized race/ethnicity coding scheme in their systems. This will facilitate the eventual implementation of a statewide DMC data collection program.

**Conclusion:** Reliance on the Illinois Criminal History record Information (CHRI) System as a statewide source for arrest, referral for prosecution, and transfer to adult court decision points, while convenient, will lead to an undercounting of the least serious offending youth. By statute, misdemeanor offenses are not required to be submitted to the CHRI System, and arrest dispositions indicating diversion decisions are optional fields (and rarely used, hence the use of local data for analysis of RRI at this decision point). Further, the submission of such optional

youth's arrest cards into the CHRI System creates official criminal history records for those individuals, which may have long-term negative collateral consequences that far outweigh the statistical information that might be gained.

**Recommendation:** Establish data sources that would NOT create an official criminal history record for youth who would not otherwise counted.

**Conclusion:** AOIC does not provide court activity data by demographics or offense categories in their Annual Reports for use as a potential statewide source for the petitions filed and court adjudications decision points.

**Recommendation:** Pass legislation that mandates the submission of all summary court data activity by race and ethnicity to AOIC for statistical reporting purposes in their Annual Report, including petitions filed and cases adjudicated delinquent.

**Conclusion:** This project was forced to rely on six major probation information systems across the state, because AOIC does not have any automated system to capture the data on the Monthly Juvenile Probation Report submitted by probation offices on a monthly basis via paper forms.

**Recommendation:** Support AOIC efforts to obtain funding for implementation of automated statewide probation information system.

**Conclusion:** Data on decision points not captured by a statewide system, particularly those at court and probation, are not uniform across counties or within counties. Across counties, different terms are used for the same type of decision point. Even within a county multiple terms may indicate the same decision point. For example, some counties use the terms "probation" and/or "supervision" for the probation decision point. Some counties separate out disposition and sentence fields, while both fields have decision point data available within them.

**Recommendation:** Counties need to be educated on the nine decision points, as defined by OJJDP. The eventual implementation of a statewide DMC data collection mechanism separate from current management information systems will assist with this standardization of definitions.

**Conclusion:** Data obtained for this project was linked from decision point to decision point as was necessary to fulfill the OJJDP formula. However, the formula could not account for the discrepancies present in a data infrastructure that is fractured from decision point to decision point. The appropriate population ranges vary at each decision point in a particular calendar year, such that applying one overall county population of youth 10-16 leads to some misleading results.

**Recommendation:** Allow for the use of different population ranges for the denominator used to calculate RRI in the OJJDP tool.

**Conclusion:** It is difficult to obtain reliable information on youth transferred to adult court. Multiple data sources yielded different totals.

**Recommendation:** AOIC should resume collecting and reporting data on youth transferred to adult court, as was done prior to 2000.

**Conclusion:** As one large county was able to provide data for all decision points with the exception of adjudications (although the probation field appears to be undercounting the number of youth sentenced to probation), this county system should be used as a model for other counties trying to collect the same data.

**Recommendation:** Make the data system in use available to other counties and provide assistance so that the adjudication data can be added to what is already collected.

**Conclusion:** Given the method used to use to collect the data and the population data applied in the RRI formula, extreme caution should be used in interpreting and using the results obtained.

**Recommendation:** Prepare a detailed data collection plan based on this experience of this project, to produce more reliable results. To raise the awareness and cooperation necessary to reduce juvenile Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in Illinois, legislation should be passed to mandate the reporting of aggregate monthly statistics on the race and gender of youth at each of the nine decision points mandated by OJJDP, with that new DMC data collection program placed under the auspices of the Juvenile Justice Commission. In response to that reporting mandate, the Juvenile Justice Commission should build a DMC specific data collection mechanism, and provide training to ensure consistency in data collection efforts. Ideally, data collection should be the responsibility of one designated entity (preferably the same entity) in each county. If this is done, it will finally be possible to measure DMC and monitor improvement at both county level and state level.

**Conclusion:** According to the data used for this analysis, minority youth were over represented at the arrest decision point (RRI =1.51), referral to court decision point (RRI=3.04), and the secure confinement decision point (RRI=3.81). Although the data for arrest and secure confinement have their limitations, they do come from statewide systems so the indices calculated should be considered somewhat reliable. The referral data, however, were gathered using many different data sources. Therefore, the indices calculated for this decision point should be considered with more caution than the indices for the other two decision points.

**Recommendation:** These findings suggest efforts need to be made at these specific decision points to identify what leads to the over representation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system. In addition, as the data for these decision points (excluding the referral to court decision point) came from one data source, the data are considered more reliable and accurate than data that came from many different data sources.

**Conclusion:** According to the data used for this analysis, minority youth were under represented at the diversion decision point (RRI =0.57), petitions filed decision point (RRI=0.87), the adjudication decision point (RRI=0.38), probation decision point (RRI=0.91), and the transfer to adult court decision point (RRI=0.51). The data for transfers to adult court come from a

statewide system and is considered somewhat reliable. The data for the other decision points have their limitations, as they come from many different data sources. Therefore, the indices calculated for these decision points should be considered with caution.

**Recommendation:** Although the data indicate under representation of minority youth occur at more decision points than over representation, this is more likely a result of the data and not a true reflection of activity. Efforts need to be made to collect data for these specific decision points from a single source so that the data can be trusted and used for strategic planning.

**Conclusion:** According to the data used for this analysis, minority youth were almost equally represented at the detention decision point (RRI=0.99). These data have few limitations and come from one statewide system so the indices calculated should be considered very reliable.

**Recommendation:** interestingly, this is the only decision point where, in the case of pre-adjudicatory detainment in a detention center, a screening instrument is used to determine whether or not a youth will be detained. This suggests that the use of a standardized, reliable screening instrument minimizes the use of discretion at that particular decision point and makes decisions based on specific criteria outlined in the instrument.

However, the detention screening instrument should be examined to determine if it is being used consistently statewide. In addition, conversations with decision makers, including those conducting the screening assessment as well as judges who hand down sentences to detention as a sanction would allow researchers to determine how the decision-making process works. This can be a model for the collection of data at other decision points.

**Conclusion:** The reliability of the data at the county level needs to be assessed to allow more confidence in the indices calculated.

**Recommendation:** Conduct site visits for each county to learn more about the data systems in use (consistency in data reporting). Concurrently, a data collection tool needs to be developed and distributed to the 41 counties to begin annual data collection for future statewide DMC assessments.

# SURVEY DATA TABLES

TABLE 1 – OVERALL FREQUENCY ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESPONSES

TABLE 2 – FREQUENCY ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESPONSES GROUPED BY OCCUPATION

TABLE 3 – FREQUENCY ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESPONSES GROUPED BY 4 COUNTY GROUPS (COOK COUNTY, COLLAR COUNTIES, MEDIUM COUNTIES AND RURAL COUNTIES)

TABLE 4 – FREQUENCY ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESPONSES GROUPED BY JOB EXPERIENCE

TABLE 5 – FREQUENCY ANALYSIS OF SURVEY RESPONSES GROUPED BY THREE DMC PILOT SITES

Center for Prevention Research & Development,  
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign

**Section 4 – Survey Data Table 1**  
**Juvenile Justice Survey**  
**Overall Frequency Analysis of Responses – All Data Combined**

Notes:

- Not all survey respondents answered each question. The number (n) of survey respondents answering each question will be displayed in each table as n=, as applicable. If the n is not shown, it is typically due to multiple responses from each respondent are allowed.
- Percentages shown are rounded; therefore at times the total percentages may be slightly lower or higher than 100%.

**Demographics**

Illinois Counties Represented = 63 (62% of all IL Counties) n=660				
Adams	DuPage	Knox	McHenry	Stephen
Boone	Edwards	Lake	McLean	Tazewell
Brown	Franklin	LaSalle	Montgomery	Union
Carroll	Fulton	Lawrence	Ogle	Vermilion
Champaign	Grundy	Lee	Peoria	Warren
Clark	Henry	Livingston	Randolph	Wabash
Clay	Iroquois	Macon	Richland	Whiteside
Clinton	Jackson	Macoupin	Rock Island	Will
Coles	Jasper	Madison	Saline	Williamson
Cook	Jefferson	Marion	Sangamon	Winnebago
Crawford	Kane	Mason	Schuyler	Woodford
DeKalb	Kankakee	Massac	Shelby	Statewide
DeWitt	Kendall	McDonough	St. Clair	

Current occupation	n=659
Department of Juvenile Justice	1%
Detention/Probation/Court Service Staff	12%
Judge/Other Court Official/State’s Attorney/Public Defender	7%
Police/Law Enforcement	77%
Other	3%

<b>Year began working in current field</b>	<b>n=654</b>
Prior to 2000	65%
2000 -2004	18%
2005 -2009	15%
2010 – present	2%

<b>Retired</b>	<b>n=654</b>
Yes	5%
No	95%

<b>Year the respondent began working for their current employer</b>	<b>n=658</b>
Prior to 2000	54%
2000-2005	27%
2006 - Present	18%

<b>Age</b>	<b>n=645</b>
<20	0%
20-25	1%
26-30	6%
31-35	16%
36-40	16%
41-45	18%
46-50	18%
51-55	11%
56-60	10%
61-65	4%
>65	1%

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>n=636</b>
Hispanic	6%
Non-Hispanic	94%

<b>What is your Race?</b>	<b>n=643</b>
Black/African American	6%
White/Caucasian	89%
Asian	1%
Native American or Native Alaskan	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0%
Multi-racial	2%
Other (Hispanic, Mexican and Mexican American were written in)	1%

<b>Gender</b>	<b>n=635</b>
Male	77%
Female	23%

<b>Highest level of Education</b>	<b>n=645</b>
High School	2%
Technical Vocational School	1%
Some college	20%
College graduate	47%
Graduate school	29%

<b>How closely do the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?</b>	<b>n=654</b>
Few minorities in my agency	49%
More minorities in my agency	5%
About the same	42%
Don't Know	4%

## Interaction with Juveniles

How do you typically determine the age of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	
I ask them their age	75%
I look at their driver's license and determine their age	46%
I look them up on my computer	28%
Other	10%

Responses to the "Other" category for "How do you typically determine age..."
After years of experience, I can determine by observation.
Age is determined by police report
Ask parents.
Ask their birth date-check if it matches their stated age
birth certificate
check with area schools
Combination of asking and verifying by identification
court documentation
estimate by appearance
first I ask then I look in computer
From police reports and child welfare agencies' reports.
Get birth date from school records
I guess
I have reports with their birth date usually
I have their age from the police report. In the State's Attorney's Office we see the cases first at the report stage (generally)
I know they are juveniles because I interact w/them during dept.-supervised activities.
I know who they would be from previous contacts.
I look at the pleadings.
I look for identification and engage them in conversation as well.
I use my judgment
I usually have records that show their age prior to my interacting with them.
I work exclusively with Juveniles
It depends on the situation. I always ask for I.D., even if they appear to be young. If they don't provide one then I ask them for their age.
It's in the file

<b>"Other" category for "How do you typically determine age..." - continued</b>
listed in court documents
look at arrest history
look at the pleadings
Look at the referral sheet or talk to the assigned probation officer.
Look at their appearance, demeanor, and totality of the circumstances.
Look at their characteristics
only work with Juveniles
Our agency asks when the person when they come into the facility
pleadings in the case
Police Offense Reports
POLICE REPORT
Police report/referral
read pleadings
Read the police report or Juvenile Petition
Reference written Court documents
referral documents
Referral paperwork
Review lock up Report
Small Town. Know everyone
That determination is made before they appear before me.
the court documents I have before me tell me their age
their date of birth is listed on the petition the state files
Their name, age and date of birth usually comes with the adjudication material given by a supervisor, once a case is assigned to a Probation Officer, so the age is already known by the time we meet the juvenile.
They wouldn't be in Juv. Ct if they weren't a juvenile.
Typically I do not require knowing a person's age.
verify by birth certificate
We already have access to their DOB

How do you typically determine the ethnicity/race of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	
I ask them their ethnicity/race	40%
I look at their driver's license and determine their ethnicity/race	34%
I look them up on my computer	14%
Other	32%

Responses to the "Other" category for "How do you typically determine ethnicity/race..."
Appearance
As a law enforcement officer, we are not allowed to ask the race of a person unless they are under arrest. For the most part, we guess.
Ask Parents
Based on observation
best guess without trying to offend
Best judgment.
By appearance
By look or speech.
By looking at them
By sight
By state ID & visual conformation.
By their appearance
By viewing in person and if unable to determine, ask.
By looking at them
Can usually determine by looking, but if I don't know, I don't ask.
check the arrest history
compare name to looks
court documentation
depending on race can determine by looking
Determine by observation.
Doesn't matter unless required on a report. Then I guess based on visual observations.
Don't ask, Don't want to know unless arrested
educated guess
Either the court documents list ethnicity or I don't ask--I don't need to know someone's exact ethnicity for my job
Either we ask or it is indicated on arrest report.
Engage in polite conversation
For traffic stop data, make an educated guess

<b>"Other" category for "How do you typically determine ethnicity/race..." - continued</b>
from probation
General observations
Generally guessing using skin tone and surname, if unsure then I ask.
Guess
Guess, as required by the Illinois Traffic Stop Statistical Study legislation.
How they look and last name (sometimes first name)
I am more than likely able to determine by appearance.
I AM NOT SURE I EVEN INQUIRE ABOUT THIS. I KEEP NO RECORDS LIKE THIS.
I ask if it is not clearly apparent.
I can either tell by looking or if necessary I ask them. Sometimes we know because the parents have informed our deputy that they need an interpreter for a specific language
I can tell in my community.
I can usually tell by looking at them.
I can usually tell. if I arrest them I ask ethnicity etc. during processing
I determine by sight. If necessary, I would ask.
I determine just by looking at them
I determine their race / ethnicity by looking at them
I do not ask.
I do not determine race
I don't ask. I just make the best determination I can.
I don't attempt to determine Race unless it is necessary.
I don't typically pre-occupy myself w/race or ethnicity
I guess
I guess it based on look
I guess. we are not allowed to ask ethnicity
I have their age from the police report. In the State's Attorney's Office we see the cases first at the report stage (generally)
I just guess
I just look at them.
I know from family contacts and previous personal contacts
I look at them
I look at their appearance
I look at their coloring and facial features
I look at their physical characteristics
I look at them and guess
I look at them and if it is not obvious I ask, but only if this is needed for report purposes or the stupid data collection sheet we have to fill out every time we conduct a traffic stop
I look at them personally and determine.
I look at them, Best guess
I make a guess on street unless it's a custodial arrest
I make an initial judgment based on physical appearance
I make my best determination by using visible clues

<b>"Other" category for "How do you typically determine ethnicity/race..." - continued</b>
I make the best possible guess based on my experience.
I often don't need to know their ethnicity or race except to complete information required under the racial profiling traffic data studies statutes. Then I make a determination of race from my observations. I don't ask them
I read the police report of the Juvenile Petition
I really don't find it all that relevant to determine race or ethnicity immediately when I stop someone. If it is a necessary determination, I try to use my experience gathered by interacting and listening to people. I may as
I take an educated guess, based on appearance
I try to make a judgment from their appearance.
I use my judgment
I usually don't ask
I usually see no reason to determine ethnicity or race, but ask them if it is.
I work in an all-black community. Not really an issue
If it is not listed on police report, then I may ask
If it's not apparent, I ask.
If not old enough for driver's license I make a determination of ethnicity/race by visual observation
If that information is necessary, I look at the information provided in the file.
In person viewing
In the past I have generally "guessed" so as not to offend anyone if I wasn't sure.
Judgment call
Just look at them and decide
Just observe the obvious
know
listed in court documents
Logic
look at the person
Look at their characteristics
look at them & talk to them
Look at them and if not sure ask.
Looks
Make my own determination
My interpretation
My own observation
name and skin color
not allowed to ask, best guess
Observe their race
Obtain through conversation not a direct question
On sentencing reports, that information is provided to me. Probation asks that question
On view identification.
Own Judgment
perceived race by looking at them

<b>“Other” category for “How do you typically determine ethnicity/race...” - continued</b>
Personal judgment
Personal observation
Physical appearance
Physical observations of subject
Police Report
police reports, pictures
primarily by looks or perception
Race is usually not an issue.
referral paperwork
Self-determined - I would never ask (it's rude)
Sight
Since I interact with juveniles only in the courtroom, I can usually determine ethnicity by sight.
Sometimes the answer to what race they are is obvious to determine just by looking at them, thereby negating the need to ask.
subjective determination- isn't that the law in Illinois
SUBJECTIVE OPINION OF OBSERVER
Subjectively per traffic stop statistical data law
Subjectively speculate
The only ones that I would not know would be bi-racial juveniles
The Police Report and in the JEMS system clarifies
THEIR APPEARANCE
Their ethnicity or race is not relevant to me
They will tell me their ethnicity or if I meet them in court the social history will contain this information.
Through my observation of the person.
Typically I do not require knowing a person's race / gender
Unless the person is being arrested, I don't care what their race is-it's not relevant to my job
Use my visual skills, if I can't tell, I don't ask because it's irrelevant.
Usually by looks
usually can tell just by looking at them what their ethnicity is
visual check unless further documentation is made, then additional confirmation is standard
visual observation and determination
Visual observation and questioning
visual only prior to booking
visual recognition
Visual recognition unless unable to determine, then ask
visual with name
Visually
We never ask. We are told that the state requirement is simply to guess.

<b>Do you report the ethnicity/race of the juvenile?</b>	<b>n=627</b>
Yes	69%
No	22%
Don't Know	9%

## Perceptions/Social Conditions

In my community...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree	Don't Know	Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree
The juvenile court is too lenient	76%	4%	20%
Youth are arrested for many things that should be handled by their parents	58%	3%	39%
Police are tougher on people of color (non-whites)	16%	8%	76%
Police tend to treat poor people and rich people differently	36%	7%	58%
People with high income get better legal advice and representation than people with low income	76%	9%	15%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be arrested by police, even for similar behavior	23%	8%	69%
The juvenile court is too punitive	16%	19%	65%
Juvenile courts need to employ more people of color	15%	54%	30%
The court treats native English speakers better than people with little or no English	13%	32%	55%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be transferred to adult court, even for similar charges	10%	31%	60%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be adjudicated in court, even for similar charges.	14%	28%	58%
People of color are reluctant to stand up for their legal rights in court	14%	26%	60%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be prosecuted by the justice system, even for similar charges	14%	19%	67%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be confined by the justice system, even for similar charges	19%	22%	59%

<b>I trust the following groups to deal with juveniles in the justice system fairly</b>	<b>Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
Corrections Staff	69%	21%	11%
Detention Staff	74%	17%	9%
Judges and other court personnel	89%	3%	8%
Police and other law enforcement personnel	87%	2%	10%
Probation Officers and other law enforcement personnel	86%	8%	6%
Social Service agencies	79%	12%	9%
Prosecutors and other State's Attorney personnel	82%	6%	11%
Public Defenders and other Public Defender personnel	80%	9%	11%
Teachers and other school officials	75%	13%	12%

<b>The way juveniles are handled by the justice system is influenced by the juvenile's...</b>	<b>Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>	<b>Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree</b>
Ability to speak English	28%	20%	52%
Access to social services	43%	21%	35%
Age	67%	10%	23%
Community's attitudes towards youth	50%	16%	34%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	30%	14%	56%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	81%	4%	14%
Family connections	60%	13%	27%
Family living situation	61%	13%	26%
Gang affiliation	82%	8%	10%
Gender	27%	19%	54%
General demeanor and appearance	70%	12%	19%
History of violent behavior	90%	4%	6%
Intelligence	45%	19%	37%
Local culture	37%	26%	36%
Mental health issues	75%	10%	15%
Record of prior offenses	89%	3%	7%
Parent's attitudes	74%	11%	16%
Parent's involvement	79%	9%	12%
Religion	7%	19%	74%
Sexual Orientation	10%	19%	71%
Socio-economic status	33%	15%	51%
Stereotypes	26%	21%	53%
Success in school	58%	15%	27%

<b>Have you seen any discrimination of youth in the juvenile justice system that involved the juvenile's...</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Ability to speak English	8%	92%
Access to social services	8%	92%
Age	9%	91%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	14%	86%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	22%	78%
Family connections	30%	70%
Family living situation	20%	80%
Gang affiliation	28%	72%
Gender	10%	90%
General demeanor and appearance	25%	75%
History of violent behavior	31%	69%
Intelligence	12%	88%
Local culture	11%	89%
Mental health issues	22%	78%
Record of prior offenses	31%	69%
Parent's attitudes	27%	73%
Parent's involvement	28%	72%
Religion	2%	98%
Sexual Orientation	5%	95%
Socio-economic status	17%	83%

<b>At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>A Little</b>	<b>A Good Bit</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
Initial police contact	8%	16%	69%	6%
Station Adjustment	8%	18%	67%	7%
Arrest	8%	31%	55%	6%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	17%	31%	28%	24%
Detention Hearing	9%	32%	30%	29%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	14%	27%	18%	42%
Delinquency Petition	9%	29%	31%	31%
Adjudication Hearing	10%	29%	27%	33%
Probation	7%	25%	37%	31%
Sentencing Hearing	8%	28%	32%	31%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	9%	23%	20%	48%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	9%	22%	20%	49%

**Survey Questions 15A – 15F**

Juvenile crime and delinquency is relatively common in most communities as youth struggle with the transition to childhood through adolescence and into young adulthood. To better understand perceptions with different groups of juveniles, we would like to know the gender, race, and ethnicity of the juveniles you encounter in your position. Based on your observations and experience as a police officer, probation officer, etc., in your current community, how would you estimate the percentage of youth for the following gender, race and ethnic groups (ages 10-17) that are committing status offenses, delinquent and other criminal acts in each group and subgroup? Select the closest percentage provided.

Status offenses (e.g., curfew violations, runaways, etc.)	0% - 25%	50%	75% - 100%
White males	46%	25%	29%
White females	67%	19%	14%
Black males	59%	22%	19%
Black females	73%	18%	10%
Hispanic/Latino males	69%	21%	10%
Hispanic/Latino females	80%	15%	5%
Asian males	97%	3%	0%
Asian females	97%	3%	0%
Other	97%	2%	1%

<b>“Other” comments (These comments were repeated for all of the “other” options for questions 15A-15F, however only listed once here in the Survey Tables section.</b>
Arabs
Assyrian
Black / white mixture
Don't know.
Few Asians, Hispanic or Latino youths in our communities. Less than 25% for all other.
I deal with small groups of Asian Indian, and Arabic community youth.
I would say 95 % of crimes are committed by either white males or females, males being the slightly higher percentage of the two and that about 5% are committed by black offenders. That is relatively proportionate to our population
In Chicago we have Black Latinos, we have white Latinos, middle eastern M/F often assumed their Latino, we have Europeans that do not fit into categories of white or black. In Chicago you have Jamaicans, Haitians and Africans
Indian
Indian Population

<b>“Other” comments continued</b>
middle eastern
Middle Eastern/Arabic Males
mistake on answering
Mixed race
mixed races
Native Americans
None
There is a very small population in the area that we deal with that are of the Hispanic and Asian groups
This is a very difficult and strangely phrases question which I fear will produce odd results
Those of mixed race. (I've seen more females commit status offenses, than males, of any race.)
VERY FEW, IF ANY ASIAN OR OTHER IN COMMUNITY
very little Asian population
We have very limited contact or arrests with anyone other than white, black, or Hispanic.
We see very low levels of Hispanic youth in our juvenile justice system and almost non-existent levels of Asian youth in our juvenile justice system. Each 25% is on the low side of 25%

<b>Vandalism or Property Crime</b>	<b>0% - 25%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75% - 100%</b>
White males	35%	29%	36%
White females	84%	9%	7%
Black males	57%	23%	20%
Black females	83%	12%	5%
Hispanic/Latino males	65%	22%	13%
Hispanic/Latino females	87%	9%	4%
Asian males	97%	2%	1%
Asian females	98%	2%	0%
Other	97%	3%	1%

<b>Illicit or Illegal Drug Use</b>	<b>0% - 25%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75% - 100%</b>
White males	29%	37%	34%
White females	61%	27%	12%
Black males	46%	26%	28%
Black females	69%	20%	12%
Hispanic/Latino males	57%	25%	17%
Hispanic/Latino females	76%	17%	7%
Asian males	94%	4%	2%
Asian females	95%	3%	2%
Other	95%	4%	1%

<b>Underage Alcohol Use</b>	<b>0% - 25%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75% - 100%</b>
White males	18%	31%	51%
White females	38%	33%	29%
Black males	49%	26%	25%
Black females	64%	21%	15%
Hispanic/Latino males	51%	25%	23%
Hispanic/Latino females	65%	21%	15%
Asian males	90%	5%	4%
Asian females	91%	5%	3%
Other	92%	5%	3%

<b>Shoplifting, Petty Theft or Stealing</b>	<b>0% - 25%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75% - 100%</b>
White males	51%	27%	22%
White females	49%	28%	23%
Black males	51%	28%	21%
Black females	54%	25%	22%
Hispanic/Latino males	69%	22%	9%
Hispanic/Latino females	70%	20%	10%
Asian males	94%	5%	1%
Asian females	95%	5%	1%
Other	94%	5%	1%

<b>Assault and Battery</b>	<b>0% - 25%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>75% - 100%</b>
White males	40%	30%	30%
White females	74%	16%	10%
Black males	42%	26%	32%
Black females	63%	19%	18%
Hispanic/Latino males	54%	25%	21%
Hispanic/Latino females	74%	17%	9%
Asian males	95%	4%	2%
Asian females	96%	4%	0%
Other	96%	3%	1%

## Rules/Procedures/Decision Making

How familiar are you with the concept of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system?	Not Familiar at All	Somewhat Familiar	Very Familiar
n=655	53%	34%	13%

How familiar are your professional colleagues with the concept of DMC in the juvenile justice system?	Not Familiar at All	Somewhat Familiar	Very Familiar	Don't Know
n=652	41%	31%	7%	21%

Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?	Yes	No	Don't Know
n=654	18%	78%	4%

If you have participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC, to what extent has your participation changed how you do your job?	Not at All	Some	A Good Bit
n=424	75%	20%	5%

Do you believe that you are making different decisions towards the involved youth than you were before you participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?	Yes	No
n=406	12%	88%

If “Yes” to the question above, survey responder could provide narrative for their decision making:
I make sure that my decisions provide for the less restrictive environment without endangering the safety of the community.
As a DMC site, we used data to make informed decisions about juvenile detention & Failure to Appear warrants, as well as in 2 other juvenile justice initiatives: Juv. Redeploy IL & 2nd Chance Juv. Reentry.
DMC exposure caused me to ask the critical questions like "why are we not considering a station adjustment instead of charging referral for 'this' juvenile like we did for 'that' juvenile?"
Have met with minority leaders in the community to work on developing resources for minority youth, have broadened my concept of "family" in minority cases to allow other family members to have custody of juvenile
I am more aware through the data and collaboration.
I believe that, through my trainings, I have been able to develop a skill set wherein I can listen to my clients and treat them more fairly than they were when they encountered the system.
I deal with each case fairly regardless of race/ethnicity
I don't base decisions based on age, race, or gender. Decisions are behavioral based.
I don't have any experience in this area so I can't participate in these questions.
I don't treat my clients differently based on race or ethnicity and I don't see the court system while I am in court doing it that much either. I am sure the police probably are but as for the treatment when they walk into c
I try to make sure my own cultural bias does not override fair and impartial interactions or decisions with youth.
I was aware and sensitive to this problem before it became a popular issue and therefore had used this awareness to inform my approach before I participated in the training.
More informed decisions
MY primary training in this area is the book “The New Jim Crow”. Having read the book I believe that it is incumbent on each of us to make changes related to social injustice.
The training and contact with DMC occurred prior to my employment
Training will do nothing to change DMC. Minorities commit a higher percentage of crimes in our community. We only respond to calls for service. When crime trends change, DMC will change.
We are aware of the DMC issues in our community, but it's not as simple as just the statistics would suggest
You look at the family dynamics in relation to culture and how it effects the youth of today. Law Enforcement needs to address the human element more often instead of black and white issues.
I make sure that my decisions provide for the less restrictive environment without endangering the safety of the community.

-----

The next two tables represent only those 18% that responded **YES** to the question “**Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?**” on Page 17

**Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?**

<b>If you have participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC, to what extent has your participation changed how you do your job?</b>	<b>Not at All</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>A Good Bit</b>
<b>n=118</b>	35%	50%	15%

<b>Do you believe that you are making different decisions towards the involved youth than you were before you participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>n=118</b>	24%	76%

-----

<b>Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings on juvenile offenders that addressed the following Evidence-based practices?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Not applicable to my position</b>
Standardized risk and assessment tools	36%	42%	22%
Clinical needs assessment tools	26%	49%	26%
Standardized detention admission tools	30%	46%	24%
Culturally sensitive offender services	27%	51%	22%
Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)	32%	46%	22%
Zero tolerance in schools	40%	42%	18%
Any other?	5%	70%	25%

<b>List of "Any other" comments from the last question above</b>
All kinds of training over 25 years.
Basic Juvenile Officer Training
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy; Brief Strategic Family Intervention; Family Skills Training
College related courses - secondary deviance.
GANGS
gender specific programming, special education trainings that address the disparity in identification and services
Harassment and Diversity training Bullying
Impact of trauma on youth
JDAI, PBIS
NEMRT training and juvenile delinquency courses in college.
SCHOOL TO PRISON PIPELINE

<b>Does your agency have any policy and procedures documentation that addresses DMC?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
<b>n=645</b>	12%	52%	35%

<b>Are the DMC policies and procedures followed within your agency?</b>	<b>Not at All</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>Completely</b>	<b>Don't Know</b>
<b>n=519</b>	15%	8%	11%	67%

## Section 4 – Survey Data Table 2

### Juvenile Justice Survey

#### Frequency Analysis of Responses – Grouped by Occupation

- Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff
- Judge/Other Court Officer/State’s Attorney/Public Defender
- Police/Law Enforcement

#### Notes:

- Not all survey respondents answered each question. The number (n) of survey respondents answering each question will be displayed in each table as n=, as applicable. If the n is not shown, it is typically due to multiple responses from each respondent are allowed.
- Percentages shown are rounded; therefore at times the total percentages may be slightly lower or higher than 100%.
- IDJJ had <10 responses, consequently, these numbers were too small to be shown on these tables. And “Other” occupation is also not displayed.

## Demographics

Current occupation	n=633
Detention/Probation/Court Service Staff	13%
Judge/Other Court Official/State’s Attorney/Public Defender	7%
Police/Law Enforcement	80%

What County do you live in? n=622	Detention/Probation /Court Service Staff n=78	Judge/Other Court Official/State’s Attorney/Public Defender n=40	Police/Law Enforcement n=504
Cook county	53%	9%	28%
Collar Counties	6%	11%	34%
Medium Counties	15%	22%	13%
Rural Counties	24%	56%	23%

<b>Year began working in current field n=627</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=79</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=45</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=503</b>
Prior to 2000	72%	58%	65%
2000 -2004	18%	4%	19%
2005 -2009	10%	31%	13%
2010 – present	0%	7%	2%

<b>Retired n=627</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=78</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=45</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=504</b>
Yes	1%	4%	4%
No	99%	96%	96%

<b>Year the respondent began working for their current employer n=631</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=79</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=45</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=507</b>
Prior to 2000	65%	33%	54%
2000-2005	28%	31%	27%
2006 - Present	8%	35%	19%

<b>Age n=618</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=76</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=43</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=499</b>
<20	0%	0%	0%
20-25	0%	0%	0%
26-30	7%	9%	6%
31-35	16%	5%	18%
36-40	26%	7%	16%
41-45	13%	14%	19%
46-50	16%	19%	18%
51-55	9%	14%	10%
56-60	9%	23%	9%
61-65	4%	9%	3%
>65	0%	0%	1%

<b>Ethnicity n=611</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=77</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n= 42</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=492</b>
Hispanic	9%	2%	5%
Non-Hispanic	91%	98%	95%

<b>What is your Race? n=616</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=76</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=44</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=496</b>
Black/African American	21%	2%	5%
White/Caucasian	78%	93%	91%
Asian	1%	0%	1%
Native American or Native Alaskan	0%	0%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0%	2%	0%
Multi-racial	0%	0%	2%
Other (Hispanic, Mexican and Mexican American were written in)	0%	2%	1%

<b>Gender n=609</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=76</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=43</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=490</b>
Male	45%	47%	84%
Female	55%	53%	16%

<b>Highest level of Education n=619</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=79</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=44</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=496</b>
High School	1%	0%	2%
Technical Vocational School	0%	0%	1%
Some college	1%	0%	25%
College graduate	59%	5%	49%
Graduate school	38%	95%	22%

How closely do the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel? n=627	Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=79	Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=45	Police/Law Enforcement n=503
Few minorities in my agency	34%	56%	50%
More minorities in my agency	22%	0%	3%
About the same	38%	36%	43%
Don't Know	6%	9%	3%

## Interaction with Juveniles

How do you typically determine the age of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff	Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD	Police/Law Enforcement
I ask them their age	67%	49%	78%
I look at their driver's license and determine their age	5%	9%	57%
I look them up on my computer	37%	18%	28%
Other	28%	42%	4%

How do you typically determine the ethnicity/race of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff	Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD	Police/Law Enforcement
I ask them their ethnicity/race	75%	3%	36%
I look at their driver's license and determine their ethnicity/race	3%	9%	42%
I look them up on my computer	20%	16%	12%
Other	22%	60%	33%

Do you report the ethnicity/race of the juvenile? Total n=602	Detention/Probation/ Court Services Staff n=76	Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD n=43	Police/Law Enforcement n=483
Yes	76%	9%	74%
No	17%	84%	16%
Don't Know	7%	7%	10%

## Perceptions/Social Conditions

**D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses**

**J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses**

**P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses**

In my community...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree			Don't Know			Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
The juvenile court is too lenient	59%	29%	83%	1%	2%	5%	39%	69%	13%
Youth are arrested for many things that should be handled by their parents	64%	76%	55%	4%	0%	3%	32%	24%	42%
Police are tougher on people of color (non-whites)	44%	43%	8%	25%	23%	4%	31%	34%	88%
Police tend to treat poor people and rich people differently	67%	66%	27%	14%	9%	5%	19%	25%	68%
People with high income get better legal advice and representation than people with low income	78%	49%	77%	4%	4%	10%	18%	47%	12%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be arrested by police, even for similar behavior	58%	42%	16%	13%	13%	6%	29%	44%	79%
The juvenile court is too punitive	28%	35%	11%	5%	0%	22%	67%	65%	66%
Juvenile courts need to employ more people of color	38%	35%	10%	25%	42%	60%	37%	23%	30%
The court treats native English speakers better than people with little or no English	27%	11%	10%	22%	9%	35%	51%	80%	55%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be transferred to adult court, even for similar charges	27%	13%	6%	22%	13%	33%	52%	73%	60%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be adjudicated in court, even for similar charges.	41%	18%	8%	10%	9%	33%	49%	73%	59%
People of color are reluctant to stand up for their legal rights in court	44%	20%	9%	17%	22%	28%	39%	58%	63%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be prosecuted by the justice system, even for similar charges	41%	22%	9%	13%	11%	20%	47%	67%	70%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be confined by the justice system, even for similar charges	48%	22%	14%	9%	11%	24%	43%	67%	62%

**D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses**  
**J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses**  
**P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses**

I trust the following groups to deal with juveniles in the justice system fairly	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree			Don't Know			Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
Corrections Staff	38%	53%	75%	33%	24%	19%	28%	22%	6%
Detention Staff	61%	71%	76%	15%	11%	18%	24%	18%	6%
Judges and other court personnel	91%	91%	89%	1%	0%	3%	8%	9%	8%
Police and other law enforcement personnel	61%	58%	95%	4%	11%	1%	35%	31%	4%
Probation Officers and other law enforcement personnel	94%	87%	85%	1%	2%	9%	5%	11%	6%
Social Service agencies	91%	80%	77%	5%	11%	13%	4%	9%	10%
Prosecutors and other State's Attorney personnel	77%	71%	84%	6%	2%	6%	16%	27%	9%
Public Defenders and other Public Defender personnel	87%	96%	77%	4%	0%	11%	9%	4%	11%
Teachers and other school officials	64%	55%	79%	10%	23%	12%	26%	23%	8%

**D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses**  
**J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses**  
**P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses**

The way juveniles are handled by the justice system is influenced by the juvenile's...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree			Don't Know			Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
Ability to speak English	38%	20%	26%	11%	16%	22%	51%	64%	52%
Access to social services	59%	71%	37%	13%	4%	25%	28%	24%	38%
Age	74%	68%	66%	6%	9%	11%	19%	23%	23%
Community's attitudes towards youth	64%	50%	48%	16%	11%	17%	21%	39%	36%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	50%	38%	25%	8%	7%	15%	42%	56%	59%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	83%	89%	80%	4%	2%	5%	13%	9%	15%
Family connections	66%	56%	58%	8%	7%	15%	27%	38%	27%
Family living situation	76%	77%	57%	9%	2%	15%	15%	20%	29%
Gang affiliation	86%	71%	83%	5%	18%	8%	9%	11%	10%
Gender	50%	31%	22%	9%	7%	22%	41%	62%	56%
General demeanor and appearance	71%	71%	69%	9%	7%	12%	19%	22%	19%
History of violence behavior	94%	91%	90%	3%	2%	4%	4%	7%	6%
Intelligence	54%	58%	42%	12%	4%	22%	35%	38%	37%
Local culture	44%	40%	35%	22%	27%	27%	35%	33%	37%
Mental health issues	85%	89%	73%	4%	0%	12%	12%	11%	15%
Record of prior offenses	94%	93%	88%	3%	0%	4%	4%	7%	8%
Parent's attitudes	76%	77%	73%	9%	5%	11%	15%	18%	16%
Parent's involvement	84%	91%	78%	5%	0%	10%	11%	9%	12%
Religion	6%	4%	7%	20%	9%	20%	73%	87%	73%
Sexual Orientation	25%	14%	6%	19%	9%	21%	56%	77%	73%
Socio-economic status	52%	49%	28%	13%	4%	17%	35%	47%	55%
Stereotypes	44%	31%	21%	22%	16%	22%	34%	53%	57%
Success in school	80%	73%	52%	5%	9%	18%	15%	18%	30%

**D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses**  
**J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses**  
**P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses**

Have you seen any discrimination of youth in the juvenile justice system that involved the juvenile's...	YES			NO		
	D	J	P	D	J	P
Ability to speak English	27%	9%	5%	73%	91%	95%
Age	23%	11%	6%	77%	89%	94%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	39%	25%	9%	61%	75%	91%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	29%	32%	19%	71%	68%	81%
Family connections	38%	49%	26%	62%	51%	74%
Family living situation	37%	49%	15%	63%	51%	85%
Gang affiliation	39%	41%	24%	61%	59%	76%
Gender	29%	11%	7%	71%	89%	93%
General demeanor and appearance	37%	37%	21%	63%	63%	79%
History of violence behavior	34%	50%	29%	66%	50%	71%
Intelligence	26%	25%	9%	74%	75%	91%
Local culture	24%	23%	8%	76%	77%	92%
Mental health issues	37%	36%	17%	63%	64%	83%
Record of prior offenses	34%	49%	28%	66%	51%	72%
Parent's attitudes	31%	44%	24%	69%	56%	76%
Parent's involvement	31%	50%	25%	69%	50%	75%
Religion	6%	2%	1%	94%	98%	99%
Sexual Orientation	14%	9%	3%	86%	91%	97%
Socio-economic status	32%	30%	13%	68%	70%	87%

D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses  
 J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses  
 P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?	None			A Little			A Good Bit			Don't Know		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
Initial police contact	27%	9%	5%	10%	7%	18%	53%	67%	73%	10%	16%	4%
Station Adjustment	27%	9%	5%	13%	14%	19%	47%	58%	71%	13%	19%	5%
Arrest	24%	8%	5%	23%	20%	34%	41%	60%	57%	12%	13%	4%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	26%	14%	16%	29%	23%	31%	36%	56%	24%	9%	7%	29%
Detention Hearing	8%	2%	11%	38%	33%	30%	53%	60%	24%	1%	5%	36%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	22%	12%	12%	41%	37%	24%	20%	21%	17%	18%	30%	47%
Delinquency Petition	15%	2%	8%	29%	29%	29%	48%	61%	26%	8%	7%	37%
Adjudication Hearing	15%	7%	10%	32%	33%	28%	47%	52%	22%	6%	7%	40%
Probation	1%	0%	9%	28%	29%	25%	70%	67%	28%	1%	5%	38%
Sentencing Hearing	1%	5%	9%	37%	31%	26%	57%	62%	26%	5%	2%	39%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	5%	7%	9%	35%	19%	21%	29%	19%	18%	31%	56%	51%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	13%	5%	9%	26%	21%	21%	21%	21%	20%	41%	53%	51%

**Survey Questions 15A – 15F**

Juvenile crime and delinquency is relatively common in most communities as youth struggle with the transition to childhood through adolescence and into young adulthood. To better understand perceptions with different groups of juveniles, we would like to know the gender, race, and ethnicity of the juveniles you encounter in your position. Based on your observations and experience as a police officer, probation officer, etc., in your current community, how would you estimate the percentage of youth for the following gender, race and ethnic groups (ages 10-17) that are committing status offenses, delinquent and other criminal acts in each group and subgroup? Select the closest percentage provided.

**D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses**

**J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses**

**P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses**

Status offenses (e.g., curfew violations, runaways, etc.)	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
White males	66%	55%	41%	22%	24%	25%	12%	21%	33%
White females	77%	76%	65%	11%	20%	20%	12%	5%	15%
Black males	41%	65%	61%	27%	33%	20%	32%	3%	19%
Black females	56%	78%	75%	21%	20%	17%	23%	3%	8%
Hispanic/Latino males	53%	78%	72%	27%	19%	19%	20%	3%	9%
Hispanic/Latino females	67%	83%	83%	22%	14%	13%	11%	3%	4%
Asian males	92%	97%	97%	5%	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%
Asian females	92%	97%	97%	7%	0%	2%	1%	3%	0%
Other	94%	100%	98%	2%	0%	2%	4%	0%	0%

Vandalism or Property Crimes	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
White males	46%	26%	34%	37%	51%	26%	17%	23%	40%
White females	90%	86%	83%	9%	14%	9%	1%	0%	8%
Black males	42%	62%	59%	30%	31%	20%	27%	8%	21%
Black females	74%	88%	84%	16%	9%	11%	10%	3%	5%
Hispanic/Latino males	52%	76%	67%	31%	12%	21%	17%	12%	13%
Hispanic/Latino females	84%	83%	89%	7%	13%	8%	9%	3%	4%
Asian males	93%	97%	98%	3%	3%	1%	4%	0%	1%
Asian females	97%	97%	99%	3%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Other	97%	100%	96%	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%

**D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses**  
**J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses**  
**P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses**

Illicit or Illegal Drug Use	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
White males	29%	32%	29%	43%	37%	35%	28%	32%	36%
White females	51%	65%	63%	37%	24%	25%	13%	11%	12%
Black males	23%	61%	49%	33%	21%	25%	44%	18%	26%
Black females	47%	77%	72%	27%	9%	19%	26%	14%	9%
Hispanic/Latino males	38%	69%	60%	31%	9%	25%	31%	22%	15%
Hispanic/Latino females	54%	75%	79%	31%	13%	14%	14%	13%	6%
Asian males	90%	94%	96%	6%	3%	3%	4%	3%	1%
Asian females	91%	93%	96%	6%	3%	3%	3%	3%	1%
Other	91%	100%	96%	6%	0%	3%	3%	0%	1%

Underage Alcohol Use	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
White males	24%	26%	16%	28%	42%	31%	47%	32%	53%
White females	38%	45%	38%	34%	42%	32%	28%	13%	30%
Black males	34%	63%	51%	30%	20%	25%	36%	17%	24%
Black females	50%	75%	65%	31%	14%	20%	19%	11%	14%
Hispanic/Latino males	40%	64%	53%	27%	18%	25%	33%	18%	23%
Hispanic/Latino females	46%	69%	68%	34%	16%	18%	20%	16%	14%
Asian males	86%	94%	91%	7%	3%	5%	7%	3%	4%
Asian females	88%	94%	92%	7%	3%	5%	4%	3%	3%
Other	91%	100%	91%	6%	0%	6%	3%	0%	3%

Shoplifting, Petty Theft or Stealing	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
White males	53%	55%	50%	34%	34%	26%	12%	11%	24%
White females	43%	54%	49%	31%	27%	28%	26%	19%	23%
Black males	40%	57%	52%	38%	27%	27%	22%	16%	21%
Black females	39%	61%	56%	36%	17%	23%	25%	22%	21%
Hispanic/Latino males	58%	78%	70%	32%	9%	21%	10%	13%	8%
Hispanic/Latino females	54%	81%	72%	30%	6%	19%	16%	13%	9%
Asian males	88%	97%	95%	9%	3%	5%	3%	0%	0%
Asian females	89%	100%	95%	8%	0%	4%	3%	0%	0%
Other	91%	100%	94%	6%	0%	5%	3%	0%	0%

**D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses**  
**J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses**  
**P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses**

Assault and Battery	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	D	J	P	D	J	P	D	J	P
White males	47%	45%	38%	33%	29%	30%	19%	26%	32%
White females	64%	73%	75%	26%	19%	15%	10%	8%	10%
Black males	26%	59%	43%	36%	22%	25%	38%	19%	32%
Black females	39%	71%	66%	28%	14%	18%	32%	14%	16%
Hispanic/Latino males	39%	71%	55%	30%	15%	26%	31%	15%	19%
Hispanic/Latino females	51%	84%	78%	28%	9%	15%	21%	6%	7%
Asian males	85%	97%	96%	12%	0%	3%	3%	3%	1%
Asian females	88%	97%	98%	11%	3%	2%	2%	0%	0%
Other	91%	100%	96%	6%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%

## Rules/Procedures/Decision Making

<b>How familiar are you with the concept of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system? n=629</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Service Staff n=78</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/State's Attorney/Public Defender n=45</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=506</b>
Not Familiar at All	13%	42%	45%
Somewhat Familiar	20%	47%	33%
Very Familiar	62%	32%	5%

<b>How familiar are your professional colleagues with the concept of DMC in the juvenile justice system? n=628</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Service Staff n=78</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/State's Attorney/Public Defender n=45</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=505</b>
Not Familiar at All	10%	16%	48%
Somewhat Familiar	51%	47%	26%
Very Familiar	24%	16%	4%
Don't Know	14%	22%	22%

<b>Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC? n=628</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Service Staff n=78</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/State's Attorney/Public Defender n=45</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=505</b>
Yes	60%	49%	8%
No	32%	47%	88%
Don't Know	8%	4%	5%

<b>If you have participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC, to what extent has your participation changed how you do your job? n=404</b>	<b>Detention/Probation/ Court Service Staff n=70</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/State's Attorney/Public Defender n=28</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=306</b>
Not at All	57%	36%	83%
Some	29%	64%	14%
A Good Bit	14%	0%	3%

<b>Do you believe that you are making different decisions towards the involved youth than you were before you participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC? n=385</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Detention/Probation/Court Service Staff n=69	19%	81%
Judge/Other Court Official/State's Attorney/Public Defender n=28	14%	86%
Police/Law Enforcement n=288	10%	90%

**D = Detention/Probation/Court Services Staff Responses**

**J = Judge/Other Court Official/SAO/PD Responses**

**P = Police/Law Enforcement Responses**

<b>Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings on juvenile offenders that addressed the following Evidence-based practices?</b>	<b>Yes</b>			<b>No</b>			<b>Not applicable to my position</b>		
	<b>D</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>J</b>	<b>P</b>
Standardized risk and assessment tools	96%	64%	24%	3%	31%	49%	1%	4%	27%
Clinical needs assessment tools	74%	62%	14%	22%	33%	55%	4%	4%	31%
Standardized detention admission tools	63%	64%	21%	24%	36%	51%	13%	0%	28%
Culturally sensitive offender services	69%	41%	19%	31%	57%	54%	0%	2%	27%
Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)	86%	64%	21%	12%	36%	52%	3%	0%	27%
Zero tolerance in schools	40%	41%	41%	46%	59%	40%	14%	0%	19%
Any other?	17%	10%	3%	66%	81%	70%	17%	10%	27%

<b>Does your agency have any policy and procedures documentation that addresses DMC? n=618</b>	<b>Detention/Probation /Court Service Staff n=77</b>	<b>Detention/Probation /Court Service Staff n=45</b>	<b>Detention/ Probation/Court Service Staff n=496</b>
Yes	30%	38%	32%
No	16%	49%	36%
Don't Know	8%	57%	35%

<b>Are the DMC policies and procedures followed within your agency? n=494</b>	<b>Detention/ Probation/Court Service Staff n=69</b>	<b>Judge/Other Court Official/State's Attorney/Public Defender n=38</b>	<b>Police/Law Enforcement n=387</b>
Not at All	9%	13%	16%
Some	26%	8%	4%
Completely	7%	11%	10%
Don't Know	58%	68%	70%

## Section 4: Survey Data Table 3

### Juvenile Justice Survey

#### Frequency Analysis of Responses – Grouped by 4 County Groups

- Cook County
- Collar Counties
- Medium Counties
- Rural Counties

#### Notes:

- Not all survey respondents answered each question. The number (n) of survey respondents answering each question will be displayed in each table as n=, as applicable. If the n is not shown, it is typically due to multiple responses from each respondent are allowed.
- Percentages shown are rounded; therefore at times the total percentages may be slightly lower or higher than 100%.

### Demographics

Current occupation n=652	Cook County n=198	Collar Counties n=191	Medium Counties n=93	Rural Counties n=170
Department of Juvenile Justice	0%	1%	0%	2%
Detention/Probation/Court Service Staff	21%	3%	13%	11%
Judge/Other Court Official/State's Attorney/Public Defender	2%	3%	11%	15%
Police/Law Enforcement	73%	91%	72%	70%
Other	4%	3%	4%	2%

Year began working in current field n=647	Cook County n=197	Collar Counties n=189	Medium Counties n=92	Rural Counties n=169
Prior to 2000	70%	58%	67%	69%
2000 -2004	18%	21%	18%	14%
2005 -2009	11%	19%	11%	15%
2010 – present	2%	2%	3%	2%

<b>Retired n=648</b>	<b>Cook County n=196</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=191</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=93</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=168</b>
Yes	6%	5%	6%	3%
No	94%	95%	94%	97%

<b>Year began working for current employer n=651</b>	<b>Cook County n=197</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=191</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=93</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=170</b>
Prior to 2000	62%	47%	56%	53%
2000-2005	25%	30%	30%	25%
2006 - Present	14%	24%	13%	22%

<b>Age n=639</b>	<b>Cook County n=194</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=187</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=91</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=167</b>
<20	0%	0%	0%	0%
20-25	1%	1%	0%	1%
26-30	4%	10%	4%	5%
31-35	17%	19%	18%	12%
36-40	18%	15%	13%	19%
41-45	25%	18%	14%	11%
46-50	19%	19%	14%	19%
51-55	6%	8%	18%	14%
56-60	7%	7%	13%	14%
61-65	4%	2%	5%	5%
>65	1%	1%	0%	1%

<b>Ethnicity n=631</b>	<b>Cook County n=189</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=187</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=89</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=166</b>
Hispanic	11%	6%	2%	1%
Non- Hispanic	89%	94%	98%	99%

<b>What is your Race? n=636</b>	<b>Cook County n=192</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=184</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=92</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=168</b>
Black/African American	15%	3%	4%	2%
White/Caucasian	79%	93%	92%	96%
Asian	2%	0%	1%	1%
Native American or Native Alaskan	1%	0%	0%	1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	1%	0%	0%	1%
Multi-racial	3%	2%	1%	1%
Other (Hispanic, Mexican and Mexican American were written in)	1%	2%	1%	0%

<b>Gender n=630</b>	<b>Cook County n=194</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=183</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=90</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=163</b>
Male	72%	83%	76%	76%
Female	28%	17%	24%	24%

<b>Highest level of Education n=639</b>	<b>Cook County n=197</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=185</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=91</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=166</b>
High School	2%	2%	2%	4%
Technical Vocational School	1%	1%	1%	1%
Some college	10%	23%	26%	24%
College graduate	49%	47%	45%	47%
Graduate school	38%	26%	25%	25%

<b>How closely do the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel? n=647</b>	<b>Cook County n=197</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=189</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=93</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=168</b>
Few minorities in my agency	36%	51%	61%	53%
More minorities in my agency	11%	3%	2%	2%
About the same	48%	42%	32%	40%
Don't Know	5%	3%	4%	4%

## Interaction with Juveniles

How do you typically determine the age of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	Cook County	Collar Counties	Medium Counties	Rural Counties
I ask them their age	80%	73%	75%	70%
I look at their driver's license and determine their age	36%	60%	44%	44%
I look them up on my computer	27%	27%	37%	26%
Other	11%	6%	10%	15%

How do you typically determine the ethnicity/race of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	Cook County	Collar Counties	Medium Counties	Rural Counties
I ask them their ethnicity/race	50%	30%	40%	39%
I look at their driver's license and determine their ethnicity/race	25%	45%	33%	31%
I look them up on my computer	12%	11%	22%	14%
Other	34%	33%	31%	30%

Do you report the ethnicity/race of the juvenile? Total n=620	Cook County n=193	Collar Counties n=183	Medium Counties n=85	Rural Counties n=159
Yes	77%	68%	67%	60%
No	15%	21%	26%	30%
Don't Know	8%	11%	7%	9%

## Perceptions/Social Conditions

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

In my community...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree				Don't Know				Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
The juvenile court is too lenient	79%	71%	80%	76%	5%	7%	0%	4%	16%	22%	20%	20%
Youth are arrested for many things that should be handled by their parents	58%	53%	59%	64%	3%	4%	0%	3%	39%	44%	41%	33%
Police are tougher on people of color (non-whites)	28%	8%	13%	13%	7%	8%	6%	11%	65%	84%	82%	76%
Police tend to treat poor people and rich people differently	46%	23%	39%	34%	6%	5%	5%	9%	48%	71%	56%	57%
People with high income get better legal advice and representation than people with low income	81%	75%	73%	72%	8%	11%	9%	10%	12%	14%	19%	18%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be arrested by police, even for similar behavior	38%	16%	25%	14%	3%	9%	8%	12%	59%	76%	68%	74%
The juvenile court is too punitive	17%	15%	20%	14%	14%	22%	17%	21%	69%	63%	63%	65%
Juvenile courts need to employ more people of color	18%	9%	23%	14%	49%	67%	45%	52%	33%	24%	32%	34%
The court treats native English speakers better than people with little or no English	21%	10%	11%	8%	27%	36%	31%	33%	52%	54%	58%	60%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be transferred to adult court, even for similar charges	20%	4%	5%	6%	26%	45%	23%	26%	55%	52%	72%	68%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be adjudicated in court, even for similar charges.	24%	6%	16%	9%	27%	41%	17%	22%	49%	53%	67%	69%
People of color are reluctant to stand up for their legal rights in court	24%	8%	10%	11%	22%	36%	18%	25%	54%	55%	72%	64%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be prosecuted by the justice system, even for similar charges	27%	6%	11%	8%	14%	28%	15%	18%	59%	66%	74%	74%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be confined by the justice system, even for similar charges	33%	12%	15%	11%	17%	31%	18%	19%	49%	57%	67%	70%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

I trust the following groups to deal with juveniles in the justice system fairly	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree				Don't Know				Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
Corrections Staff	57%	75%	66%	78%	22%	21%	27%	15%	22%	4%	7%	7%
Detention Staff	60%	80%	80%	80%	19%	17%	13%	16%	20%	3%	8%	4%
Judges and other court personnel	79%	95%	95%	91%	5%	3%	1%	2%	16%	3%	4%	8%
Police and other law enforcement personnel	76%	96%	84%	92%	4%	0%	3%	2%	20%	4%	13%	5%
Probation Officers and other law enforcement personnel	77%	91%	88%	90%	12%	7%	9%	4%	11%	2%	3%	6%
Social Service agencies	77%	80%	76%	80%	12%	15%	11%	9%	11%	5%	13%	10%
Prosecutors and other State's Attorney personnel	72%	91%	81%	85%	8%	6%	8%	4%	19%	3%	12%	11%
Public Defenders and other Public Defender personnel	77%	81%	78%	82%	8%	12%	12%	7%	15%	6%	10%	11%
Teachers and other school officials	72%	82%	66%	76%	11%	12%	19%	14%	17%	7%	16%	10%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

The way juveniles are handled by the justice system is influenced by the juvenile's...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree				Don't Know				Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
Ability to speak English	36%	25%	24%	23%	16%	24%	19%	20%	48%	52%	57%	57%
Access to social services	52%	39%	39%	40%	14%	26%	26%	23%	34%	35%	35%	37%
Age	72%	63%	67%	62%	8%	11%	9%	13%	20%	22%	24%	26%
Community's attitudes towards youth	57%	43%	48%	45%	14%	19%	14%	17%	30%	33%	38%	38%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	42%	23%	26%	25%	9%	18%	12%	15%	49%	59%	62%	60%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	79%	82%	84%	82%	3%	6%	3%	4%	18%	11%	13%	14%
Family connections	65%	58%	63%	54%	10%	15%	10%	15%	25%	26%	27%	31%
Family living situation	63%	56%	57%	60%	8%	19%	9%	15%	29%	25%	24%	24%
Gang affiliation	86%	88%	82%	72%	3%	6%	8%	17%	11%	6%	11%	12%
Gender	35%	20%	29%	22%	15%	23%	17%	19%	49%	57%	53%	59%
General demeanor and appearance	73%	67%	68%	70%	8%	17%	13%	10%	19%	16%	19%	20%
History of violence behavior	89%	92%	95%	86%	5%	4%	2%	5%	7%	4%	3%	9%
Intelligence	48%	35%	45%	51%	15%	25%	17%	16%	37%	40%	38%	32%
Local culture	44%	29%	38%	38%	21%	31%	25%	29%	36%	40%	37%	33%
Mental health issues	71%	76%	80%	77%	10%	12%	8%	10%	19%	12%	13%	13%
Record of prior offenses	85%	93%	97%	86%	4%	3%	0%	4%	11%	4%	3%	9%
Parent's attitudes	73%	79%	67%	72%	8%	9%	17%	11%	19%	11%	16%	17%
Parent's involvement	80%	78%	79%	80%	7%	11%	8%	8%	13%	11%	13%	12%
Religion	6%	11%	3%	6%	20%	18%	12%	24%	74%	71%	85%	70%
Sexual Orientation	16%	9%	3%	7%	20%	18%	14%	24%	64%	73%	83%	69%
Socio-economic status	40%	25%	34%	33%	10%	19%	16%	17%	50%	56%	49%	50%
Stereotypes	32%	20%	23%	24%	15%	25%	17%	26%	53%	54%	60%	50%
Success in school	64%	52%	60%	56%	9%	20%	15%	17%	27%	29%	25%	27%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

Have you seen any discrimination of youth in the juvenile justice system that involved the juvenile's...	YES				NO			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
Ability to speak English	16%	6%	3%	5%	84%	94%	97%	95%
Age	12%	7%	10%	7%	88%	93%	90%	93%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	26%	7%	13%	8%	74%	93%	87%	92%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	23%	20%	24%	19%	77%	80%	76%	81%
Family connections	34%	26%	27%	29%	66%	74%	73%	71%
Family living situation	26%	15%	24%	17%	74%	85%	76%	83%
Gang affiliation	33%	26%	32%	21%	67%	74%	68%	79%
Gender	18%	5%	10%	6%	82%	95%	90%	94%
General demeanor and appearance	33%	21%	23%	17%	67%	79%	77%	83%
History of violence behavior	33%	31%	38%	24%	67%	69%	62%	76%
Intelligence	19%	5%	17%	8%	81%	95%	83%	92%
Local culture	17%	7%	13%	8%	83%	93%	87%	92%
Mental health issues	26%	16%	26%	20%	74%	84%	74%	80%
Record of prior offenses	34%	28%	38%	24%	66%	72%	62%	76%
Parent's attitudes	33%	25%	29%	19%	67%	75%	71%	81%
Parent's involvement	35%	24%	33%	19%	65%	76%	67%	81%
Religion	4%	1%	0%	2%	96%	99%	100%	98%
Sexual Orientation	12%	2%	1%	1%	88%	98%	99%	99%
Socio-economic status	24%	12%	18%	13%	76%	88%	82%	87%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?	None				A Little				A Good Bit				Don't Know			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
<b>All Agencies combined</b>																
Initial police contact	11%	6%	5%	7%	20%	13%	12%	18%	64%	75%	76%	67%	6%	6%	7%	7%
Station Adjustment	1%	7%	7%	9%	20%	13%	18%	21%	65%	71%	70%	62%	7%	8	5%	9%
Arrest	10%	6%	7%	7%	34%	29%	28%	33%	50%	59%	61%	54%	6%	5%	4%	7%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	19%	15%	15%	16%	39%	31%	21%	29%	23%	25%	37%	31%	19%	29%	26%	24%
Detention Hearing	9%	10%	9%	10%	34%	30%	26%	34%	30%	25%	41%	31%	28%	35%	24%	25%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	16%	11%	11%	16%	28%	25%	22%	28%	16%	19%	25%	15%	40%	45%	42%	41%
Delinquency Petition	12%	5%	6%	9%	30%	27%	28%	31%	29%	29%	39%	32%	28%	39%	27%	28%
Adjudication Hearing	10%	8%	10%	14%	31%	26%	31%	30%	26%	24%	30%	31%	34%	42%	30%	25%
Probation	8%	5%	4%	10%	24%	23%	27%	27%	36%	34%	42%	39%	32%	38%	26%	24%
Sentencing Hearing	7%	6%	7%	12%	27%	27%	30%	30%	34%	28%	36%	34%	32%	39%	28%	24%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	9%	6%	9%	10%	24%	21%	18%	27%	21%	22%	23%	15%	46%	50%	50%	47%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	11%	5%	8%	10%	19%	21%	21%	26%	20%	23%	23%	18%	51%	51%	48%	46%

Next 4 tables: Looking at the same data for the question on the previous page (page 9), but now breaking it out by each agency

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?	None				A Little				A Good Bit				Don't Know			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
Initial police contact	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%
Station Adjustment	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Arrest	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%
Detention Hearing	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Delinquency Petition	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Adjudication Hearing	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Probation	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%
Sentencing Hearing	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	33%	0%	00%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	67%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?	None				A Little				A Good Bit				Don't Know			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
<b>Detention/Prob - Court Services</b>																
Initial police contact	36%	40%	17%	6%	12%	0%	0%	17%	45%	60%	67%	61%	7%	0%	17%	17%
Station Adjustment	36%	40%	25%	0%	12%	0%	0%	28%	45%	60%	58%	44%	7%	0%	17%	28%
Arrest	31%	40%	25%	0%	31%	0%	8%	22%	31%	60%	50%	56%	7%	0%	17%	22%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	29%	60%	18%	11%	31%	20%	36%	26%	33%	20%	36%	47%	7%	0%	9%	16%
Detention Hearing	10%	20%	9%	0%	36%	60%	18%	47%	52%	20%	73%	53%	2%	0%	0%	0%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	26%	20%	25%	11%	38%	60%	8%	58%	21%	0%	33%	16%	14%	20%	33%	16%
Delinquency Petition	21%	40%	0%	0%	33%	20%	25%	26%	40%	40%	58%	63%	5%	0%	17%	11%
Adjudication Hearing	19%	60%	0%	5%	33%	20%	33%	26%	43%	20%	50%	63%	5%	0%	17%	5%
Probation	2%	0%	0%	0%	26%	40%	33%	21%	71%	60%	67%	74%	0%	0%	0%	5%
Sentencing Hearing	0%	20%	0%	0%	38%	60%	17%	37%	60%	20%	67%	58%	2%	0%	17%	5%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	7%	20%	0%	0%	37%	20%	17%	42%	34%	20%	25%	26%	22%	40%	58%	32%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	14%	20%	0%	11%	24%	40%	27%	26%	24%	0%	0%	32%	38%	40%	73%	32%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?  Judges/SAO/ Public Defenders	None				A Little				A Good Bit				Don't Know			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
Initial police contact	25%	0%	0%	13%	25%	0%	0%	8%	50%	40%	89%	67%	0%	60%	11%	13%
Station Adjustment	25%	0%	11%	8%	25%	0%	11%	17%	50%	60%	67%	54%	0%	40%	11%	21%
Arrest	25%	0%	0%	9%	50%	0%	14%	22%	25%	60%	86%	57%	0%	40%	0%	13%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	0%	0%	11%	17%	25%	40%	33%	17%	75%	20%	56%	63%	0%	40%	0%	4%
Detention Hearing	0%	0%	0%	4%	50%	60%	22%	25%	50%	20%	78%	57%	0%	20%	0%	4%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	0%	40%	0%	13%	50%	40%	44%	29%	50%	0%	33%	17%	0%	20%	22%	42%
Delinquency Petition	0%	0%	0%	4%	25%	60%	13%	30%	50%	20%	88%	61%	25%	20%	0%	4%
Adjudication Hearing	0%	0%	11%	8%	25%	75%	44%	25%	50%	0%	44%	63%	25%	25%	0%	4%
Probation	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	40%	33%	30%	100%	60%	56%	65%	0%	0%	11%	4%
Sentencing Hearing	0%	0%	11%	4%	0%	60%	33%	26%	100%	40%	56%	65%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	0%	20%	0%	8%	50%	40%	11%	13%	25%	20%	44%	8%	25%	20%	44%	71%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	0%	20%	0%	4%	25%	20%	22%	21%	50%	40%	22%	13%	25%	20%	56%	63%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?	None				A Little				A Good Bit				Don't Know			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
<b>Police/ Law Enforcement</b>																
Initial police contact	3%	5%	4%	7%	22%	13%	15%	19%	69%	77%	78%	72%	6%	5%	3%	3%
Station Adjustment	1%	6%	3%	10%	22%	14%	22%	20%	69%	72%	73%	69%	7%	8%	1%	2%
Arrest	4%	5%	4%	7%	35%	30%	34%	37%	55%	60%	60%	55%	6%	5%	1%	2%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	17%	15%	13%	17%	41%	30%	16%	32%	18%	24%	36%	22%	24%	31%	34%	29%
Detention Hearing	9%	10%	9%	13%	32%	27%	30%	33%	22%	25%	30%	20%	37%	37%	31%	34%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	13%	9%	9%	17%	25%	23%	23%	24%	13%	20%	23%	13%	49%	48%	45%	46%
Delinquency Petition	9%	5%	6%	11%	30%	25%	32%	33%	26%	29%	28%	20%	35%	42%	34%	36%
Adjudication Hearing	7%	7%	11%	17%	30%	24%	30%	32%	20%	25%	21%	19%	43%	44%	38%	32%
Probation	10%	6%	5%	14%	24%	21%	27%	28%	23%	32%	33%	28%	43%	41%	35%	30%
Sentencing Hearing	9%	6%	6%	16%	24%	23%	34%	30%	24%	29%	25%	23%	42%	42%	35%	31%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	10%	6%	12%	12%	19%	20%	18%	27%	17%	22%	20%	15%	55%	53%	49%	46%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	9%	5%	11%	12%	17%	20%	21%	26%	17%	22%	26%	17%	57%	54%	42%	45%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?  Other (Service Providers, etc.)	None				A Little				A Good Bit				Don't Know			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
Initial police contact	13%	0%	0%	0%	13%	17%	25%	50%	75%	83%	50%	25%	0%	0%	25%	25%
Station Adjustment	0%	17%	0%	0%	13%	0%	25%	50%	88%	83%	50%	25%	0%	0%	25%	25%
Arrest	0%	0%	0%	0%	13%	50%	0%	25%	88%	50%	75%	50%	0%	0%	25%	25%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	0%	0%	50%	0%	63%	67%	25%	25%	38%	33%	25%	50%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Detention Hearing	0%	0%	25%	0%	50%	50%	0%	25%	38%	33%	50%	50%	13%	17%	25%	25%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	25%	17%	25%	0%	25%	50%	0%	0%	25%	17%	25%	75%	25%	17%	50%	25%
Delinquency Petition	25%	0%	25%	0%	25%	67%	0%	0%	25%	17%	75%	75%	25%	17%	0%	25%
Adjudication Hearing	13%	0%	25%	0%	38%	60%	0%	25%	25%	20%	75%	50%	25%	20%	0%	25%
Probation	13%	0%	25%	0%	25%	50%	0%	25%	38%	50%	75%	50%	25%	0%	0%	25%
Sentencing Hearing	13%	17%	25	0%	25%	67%	0%	25%	38%	17%	75%	50%	25%	0%	0%	25%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	0%	0%	0%	0%	38%	50%	25%	50%	25%	33%	25%	25%	38%	17%	50%	25%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	25%	0%	0%	0%	25%	33%	0%	50%	25%	67%	50%	25%	25%	0%	50%	25%

**Survey Questions 15A – 15F**

Juvenile crime and delinquency is relatively common in most communities as youth struggle with the transition to childhood through adolescence and into young adulthood. To better understand perceptions with different groups of juveniles, we would like to know the gender, race, and ethnicity of the juveniles you encounter in your position. Based on your observations and experience as a police officer, probation officer, etc., in your current community, how would you estimate the percentage of youth for the following gender, race and ethnic groups (ages 10-17) that are committing status offenses, delinquent and other criminal acts in each group and subgroup? Select the closest percentage provided.

**C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties**

Status offenses (e.g., curfew violations, runaways, etc.)	0% - 25%				50%				75% - 100%			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
White males	67%	36%	40%	38%	16%	27%	34%	26%	17%	37%	26%	36%
White females	79%	59%	64%	64%	12%	24%	23%	19%	8%	17%	14%	17%
Black males	31%	73%	56%	79%	28%	20%	30%	13%	41%	7%	15%	8%
Black females	51%	83%	73%	86%	28%	14%	18%	10%	21%	3%	9%	4%
Hispanic/Latino males	54%	68%	77%	85%	28%	22%	21%	11%	18%	10%	1%	5%
Hispanic/Latino females	71%	76%	87%	92%	21%	17%	13%	6%	8%	7%	0%	2%
Asian males	97%	97%	92%	98%	2%	3%	7%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Asian females	96%	97%	93%	99%	3%	3%	7%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
Other	96%	99%	96%	99%	3%	1%	4%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

Vandalism or Property Crimes	0% - 25%				50%				75% - 100%			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
White males	50%	33%	29%	26%	29%	25%	37%	30%	21%	42%	34%	45%
White females	91%	79%	82%	83%	6%	11%	10%	10%	2%	9%	8%	7%
Black males	34%	68%	55%	74%	32%	20%	25%	13%	35%	12%	19%	13%
Black females	74%	85%	82%	91%	16%	13%	11%	7%	10%	3%	7%	2%
Hispanic/Latino males	49%	63%	78%	78%	29%	25%	14%	16%	23%	11%	9%	6%
Hispanic/Latino females	83%	84%	90%	94%	9%	11%	8%	6%	8%	5%	3%	1%
Asian males	96%	98%	95%	97%	2%	1%	4%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Asian females	98%	99%	96%	97%	2%	1%	4%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	94%	98%	94%	99%	5%	1%	6%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%

Illicit or Illegal Drug Use	0% - 25%				50%				75% - 100%			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
White males	37%	26%	26%	25%	36%	34%	46%	35%	27%	40%	28%	40%
White females	69%	55%	64%	58%	22%	31%	26%	29%	9%	14%	11%	13%
Black males	26%	56%	50%	57%	27%	32%	26%	20%	47%	13%	24%	23%
Black females	50%	77%	76%	79%	28%	19%	16%	13%	22%	5%	8%	9%
Hispanic/Latino males	40%	57%	73%	70%	31%	31%	18%	17%	29%	13%	10%	13%
Hispanic/Latino females	68%	75%	82%	81%	20%	19%	14%	13%	12%	6%	4%	6%
Asian males	95%	94%	91%	94%	2%	5%	8%	4%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Asian females	95%	96%	91%	97%	3%	2%	8%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Other	95%	94%	91%	97%	4%	4%	9%	3%	1%	2%	0%	0%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

Underage Alcohol Use	0% - 25%				50%				75% - 100%			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
White males	23%	13%	14%	19%	30%	28%	41%	31%	47%	59%	45%	50%
White females	39%	35%	40%	41%	34%	31%	36%	33%	27%	35%	24%	26%
Black males	31%	53%	55%	64%	31%	25%	29%	20%	38%	22%	16%	16%
Black females	50%	66%	72%	74%	29%	19%	19%	16%	21%	15%	10%	9%
Hispanic/Latino males	37%	49%	59%	69%	29%	29%	27%	15%	34%	22%	14%	16%
Hispanic/Latino females	52%	64%	70%	79%	29%	19%	22%	11%	19%	16%	9%	10%
Asian males	91%	88%	88%	92%	4%	8%	9%	2%	5%	4%	3%	6%
Asian females	92%	90%	88%	94%	5%	7%	9%	1%	3%	3%	3%	4%
Other	90%	94%	88%	94%	6%	4%	12%	4%	4%	2%	0%	3%

Shoplifting, Petty Theft or Stealing	0% - 25%				50%				75% - 100%			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
White males	60%	47%	53%	44%	25%	27%	27%	30%	15%	26%	20%	26%
White females	57%	49%	46%	43%	23%	26%	35%	32%	19%	26%	19%	25%
Black males	31%	57%	55%	66%	32%	27%	31%	21%	37%	15%	13%	13%
Black females	40%	60%	50%	66%	28%	21%	31%	20%	32%	19%	19%	14%
Hispanic/Latino males	57%	68%	77%	81%	31%	23%	18%	13%	12%	10%	5%	6%
Hispanic/Latino females	61%	68%	77%	80%	27%	19%	19%	13%	12%	13%	4%	6%
Asian males	93%	96%	90%	96%	7%	3%	10%	1%	0%	1%	0%	2%
Asian females	93%	95%	92%	97%	7%	3%	8%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
Other	93%	97%	91%	96%	8%	2%	9%	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

Assault and Battery	0% - 25%				50%				75% - 100%			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
White males	53%	35%	37%	31%	30%	29%	41%	24%	17%	35%	22%	44%
White females	80%	75%	69%	68%	13%	15%	19%	20%	6%	10%	12%	12%
Black males	23%	50%	41%	59%	26%	29%	33%	17%	50%	21%	26%	24%
Black females	44%	76%	59%	75%	23%	15%	25%	14%	32%	9%	16%	12%
Hispanic/Latino males	39%	52%	63%	71%	29%	30%	26%	13%	33%	17%	11%	16%
Hispanic/Latino females	63%	76%	81%	83%	18%	20%	16%	12%	19%	4%	3%	5%
Asian males	94%	96%	91%	96%	5%	2%	9%	2%	1%	2%	0%	2%
Asian females	96%	98%	94%	96%	4%	2%	6%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Other	95%	96%	91%	99%	5%	2%	9%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%

## Rules/Procedures/Decision Making

How familiar are you with the concept of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system? n=649	Cook County n=197	Collar Counties n=190	Medium Counties n=93	Rural Counties n=169
Not Familiar at All	47%	61%	55%	50%
Somewhat familiar	34%	32%	30%	40%
Very Familiar	19%	7%	15%	10%

How familiar are your professional colleagues with the concept of DMC in the juvenile justice system? n=648	Cook County n=197	Collar Counties n=190	Medium Counties n=92	Rural Counties n=169
Not Familiar at All	37%	47%	40%	40%
Somewhat Familiar	32%	25%	32%	34%
Very Familiar	12%	4%	7%	5%
Don't Know	19%	24%	22%	21%

Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC? n=648	Cook County n=197	Collar Counties n=189	Medium Counties n=93	Rural Counties n=169
Yes	23%	10%	24%	18%
No	74%	86%	71%	75%
Don't Know	3%	4%	5%	7%

<b>If you have participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC, to what extent has your participation changed how you do your job? n=420</b>	<b>Cook County n=137</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=111</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=63</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=109</b>
Not at All	72%	81%	67%	77%
Some	20%	16%	29%	19%
A Good Bit	8%	3%	5%	4%

<b>Do you believe that you are making different decisions towards the involved youth than you were before you participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC? n=403</b>	<b>Cook County n=130</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=103</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=67</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=103</b>
Yes	12%	7%	18%	11%
No	88%	93%	82%	89%

C = Cook County    CC = Collar Counties    M = Medium Counties    R = Rural Counties

Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings on juvenile offenders that addressed the following Evidence-based practices?	Yes				No				Not applicable to my position			
	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R	C	CC	M	R
Standardized risk and assessment tools	39%	25%	42%	41%	39%	49%	38%	38%	22%	26%	20%	20%
Clinical needs assessment tools	30%	18%	29%	26%	43%	52%	50%	50%	27%	29%	21%	24%
Standardized detention admission tools	25%	30%	38%	32%	46%	46%	42%	47%	30%	24%	20%	22%
Culturally sensitive offender services	30%	25%	27%	27%	45%	52%	54%	53%	24%	23%	19%	20%
Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)	40%	25%	33%	32%	38%	50%	50%	47%	22%	25%	17%	21%
Zero tolerance in schools	37%	44%	36%	43%	43%	37%	47%	43%	20%	19%	17%	14%
Any other?	6%	4%	7%	5%	65%	70%	71%	74%	29%	27%	21%	21%

Does your agency have any policy and procedures documentation that addresses DMC? n=640	Cook County n=197	Collar Counties n=184	Medium Counties n=93	Rural Counties n=166
Yes	17%	14%	11%	5%
No	42%	52%	56%	64%
Don't Know	41%	34%	33%	30%

<b>Are the DMC policies and procedures followed within your agency? n=514</b>	<b>Cook County n=173</b>	<b>Collar Counties n=147</b>	<b>Medium Counties n=70</b>	<b>Rural Counties n=124</b>
Not at All	15%	14%	9%	19%
Some	12%	3%	9%	6%
Completely	9%	16%	10%	7%
Don't Know	64%	67%	73%	68%

## Section 4 – Survey Data Table 4

### Juvenile Justice Survey

#### Frequency Analysis of Responses – Grouped by Job Experience

- Prior to year 2000
- From 2000 to date

Notes:

- Not all survey respondents answered each question. The number (n) of survey respondents answering each question will be displayed in each table as n=, as applicable. If the n is not shown, it is typically due to multiple responses from each respondent are allowed.
- Percentages shown are rounded; therefore at times the total percentages may be slightly lower or higher than 100%.

### Demographics

What county do you currently work in? n=652	Prior to 2000 n=424	From 2000 to Date n=227
Cook	32%	26%
Collar Counties	26%	35%
Medium Counties	15%	13%
Rural Counties	27%	23%

Current occupation n=653	Prior to 2000 n=426	From 2000 to Date n=227
IDJJ	0%	1%
Detention/Probation	13%	10%
Judge/SAO/PD	6%	8%
Police/Law Enforcement	77%	77%
Other	3%	4%

<b>Retired n=648</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=425</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=223</b>
Yes	7%	0%
No	93%	100%

<b>Year respondent began working for current employer n=653</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=425</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=227</b>
Prior to 2000	80%	7%
2000-2005	12%	56%
2006 – Present	9%	37%

<b>Age n=639</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=418</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=221</b>
<20	0%	0%
20-25	0%	2%
26-30	0%	18%
31-35	2%	44%
36-40	16%	17%
41-45	22%	10%
46-50	26%	5%
51-55	15%	2%
56-60	14%	2%
61-65	5%	0%
>65	1%	0%

<b>Ethnicity n=630</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=411</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=219</b>
Hispanic	6%	5%
Non-Hispanic	94%	95%

<b>Race n=637</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=418</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=219</b>
Black/African American	7%	7%
White/Caucasian	89%	89%
Asian	0%	1%
Native American or Native Alaskan	0%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0%	1%
Multi-racial	2%	1%
Other (Hispanic, Mexican and Mexican American were written in)	1%	0%

<b>Gender n=629</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=409</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=220</b>
Male	80%	69%
Female	20%	31%

<b>Highest level of Education n=639</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=417</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=222</b>
High School	2%	3%
Technical Vocational School	1%	1%
Some college	20%	20%
College graduate	46%	52%
Graduate school	31%	24%

<b>How closely do the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?</b> <b>n=648</b>	<b>Prior to 2000</b> <b>n=424</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date</b> <b>n=224</b>
Few minorities in my agency	45%	54%
More minorities in my agency	5%	6%
About the same	46%	36%
Don't Know	4%	4%

## Interaction with Juveniles

How do you typically determine the age of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	Prior to 2000	From 2000 to Date
I ask them their age	75%	76%
I look at their driver's license and determine their age	47%	44%
I look them up on my computer	28%	29%
Other	12%	8%

How do you typically determine the ethnicity/race of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	Prior to 2000	From 2000 to Date
I ask them their ethnicity/race	41%	38%
I look at their driver's license and determine their ethnicity/race	32%	37%
I look them up on my computer	12%	17%
Other	35%	26%

Do you report the ethnicity/race of the juvenile? n=621	Prior to 2000 n=403	From 2000 to Date n=218
Yes	73%	61%
No	20%	26%
Don't Know	7%	13%

## Perceptions/Social Conditions

<2000 = Prior to 2000

=>2000 = From 2000 to Date

In my community...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree		Don't Know		Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
The juvenile court is too lenient	74%	80%	4%	4%	21%	16%
Youth are arrested for many things that should be handled by their parents	60%	55%	3%	2%	37%	43%
Police are tougher on people of color (non-whites)	17%	14%	7%	10%	75%	76%
Police tend to treat poor people and rich people differently	35%	36%	6%	8%	59%	55%
People with high income get better legal advice and representation than people with low income	78%	71%	8%	12%	14%	17%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be arrested by police, even for similar behavior	23%	23%	7%	9%	70%	67%
The juvenile court is too punitive	13%	21%	14%	28%	73%	51%
Juvenile courts need to employ more people of color	18%	12%	52%	58%	31%	30%
The court treats native English speakers better than people with little or no English	15%	10%	32%	32%	53%	58%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be transferred to adult court, even for similar charges	10%	8%	28%	36%	61%	55%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be adjudicated in court, even for similar charges.	16%	8%	25%	36%	59%	56%
People of color are reluctant to stand up for their legal rights in court	17%	9%	26%	28%	58%	63%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be prosecuted by the justice system, even for similar charges	15%	12%	18%	21%	67%	66%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be confined by the justice system, even for similar charges	22%	13%	19%	27%	58%	60%

I trust the following groups to deal with juveniles in the justice system fairly	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree		Don't Know		Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
Corrections Staff	64%	77%	24%	15%	12%	8%
Detention Staff	71%	79%	19%	13%	10%	8%
Judges and other court personnel	89%	88%	3%	3%	8%	9%
Police and other law enforcement personnel	87%	88%	2%	3%	11%	9%
Probation Officers and other law enforcement personnel	86%	86%	9%	6%	5%	8%
Social Service agencies	79%	78%	12%	12%	9%	10%
Prosecutors and other State's Attorney personnel	81%	83%	6%	7%	13%	10%
Public Defenders and other Public Defender personnel	80%	80%	10%	9%	11%	11%
Teachers and other school officials	74%	76%	14%	11%	12%	13%

The way juveniles are handled by the justice system is influenced by the juvenile's...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree		Don't Know		Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
Ability to speak English	29%	27%	20%	19%	51%	54%
Access to social services	45%	40%	20%	24%	35%	36%
Age	67%	67%	10%	10%	23%	23%
Community's attitudes towards youth	49%	51%	15%	19%	36%	30%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	29%	32%	13%	15%	58%	53%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	79%	84%	4%	5%	16%	11%
Family connections	58%	63%	13%	13%	29%	24%
Family living situation	62%	60%	14%	11%	24%	29%
Gang affiliation	83%	80%	7%	9%	9%	11%
Gender	27%	26%	20%	17%	53%	57%
General demeanor and appearance	72%	66%	10%	14%	18%	20%
History of violence behavior	91%	89%	4%	4%	5%	7%
Intelligence	45%	44%	19%	17%	35%	39%
Local culture	39%	34%	26%	28%	36%	38%
Mental health issues	75%	75%	10%	9%	14%	16%
Record of prior offenses	89%	89%	3%	3%	7%	8%
Parent's attitudes	75%	72%	9%	12%	16%	16%
Parent's involvement	81%	76%	7%	11%	12%	13%
Religion	6%	9%	19%	19%	75%	72%
Sexual Orientation	10%	10%	19%	20%	71%	71%
Socio-economic status	34%	32%	15%	16%	51%	52%
Stereotypes	26%	26%	22%	19%	52%	55%
Success in school	60%	53%	14%	16%	26%	30%

Have you seen any discrimination of youth in the juvenile justice system that involved the juvenile's...	YES		NO	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
Ability to speak English	10%	6%	90%	94%
Age	9%	9%	91%	91%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	17%	9%	83%	91%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	20%	24%	80%	76%
Family connections	32%	27%	68%	73%
Family living situation	22%	18%	78%	82%
Gang affiliation	28%	28%	72%	72%
Gender	10%	10%	90%	90%
General demeanor and appearance	24%	25%	76%	75%
History of violence behavior	30%	33%	70%	67%
Intelligence	12%	12%	88%	88%
Local culture	11%	12%	89%	88%
Mental health issues	20%	24%	80%	76%
Record of prior offenses	29%	33%	71%	67%
Parent's attitudes	27%	26%	73%	74%
Parent's involvement	28%	28%	72%	72%
Religion	2%	2%	98%	98%
Sexual Orientation	5%	3%	95%	97%
Socio-economic status	19%	13%	81%	87%

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?	None		A Little		A Good Bit		Don't Know	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
Initial police contact	7%	9%	18%	14%	71%	66%	4%	11%
Station Adjustment	8%	9%	18%	18%	70%	60%	4%	13%
Arrest	9%	6%	31%	32%	57%	52%	4%	10%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	17%	17%	33%	26%	28%	26%	21%	31%
Detention Hearing	9%	10%	34%	27%	32%	26%	25%	36%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	14%	12%	28%	24%	18%	17%	39%	46%
Delinquency Petition	10%	7%	32%	24%	32%	29%	26%	41%
Adjudication Hearing	11%	10%	33%	22%	27%	28%	29%	41%
Probation	7%	8%	27%	20%	38%	35%	28%	36%
Sentencing Hearing	7%	11%	31%	22%	33%	30%	29%	37%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	9%	8%	24%	20%	20%	20%	46%	53%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	9%	8%	22%	20%	20%	20%	48%	52%

**Survey Questions 15A – 15F**

Juvenile crime and delinquency is relatively common in most communities as youth struggle with the transition to childhood through adolescence and into young adulthood. To better understand perceptions with different groups of juveniles, we would like to know the gender, race, and ethnicity of the juveniles you encounter in your position. Based on your observations and experience as a police officer, probation officer, etc., in your current community, how would you estimate the percentage of youth for the following gender, race and ethnic groups (ages 10-17) that are committing status offenses, delinquent and other criminal acts in each group and subgroup? Select the closest percentage provided.

Status offenses (e.g., curfew violations, runaways, etc.)	0% - 25%		50%		75% - 100%	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
White males	44%	51%	23%	27%	33%	22%
White females	70%	64%	15%	25%	15%	11%
Black males	60%	56%	21%	24%	19%	21%
Black females	75%	68%	17%	20%	9%	12%
Hispanic/Latino males	71%	66%	19%	24%	10%	10%
Hispanic/Latino females	82%	77%	13%	18%	5%	5%
Asian males	96%	97%	3%	3%	1%	0%
Asian females	97%	96%	3%	3%	0%	1%
Other	98%	97%	1%	2%	1%	1%

Vandalism or Property Crimes	0% - 25%		50%		75% - 100%	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
White males	33%	41%	27%	33%	40%	26%
White females	85%	82%	8%	12%	7%	6%
Black males	60%	51%	21%	25%	19%	24%
Black females	84%	80%	11%	14%	5%	7%
Hispanic/Latino males	68%	58%	18%	29%	13%	13%
Hispanic/Latino females	89%	83%	7%	12%	4%	5%
Asian males	96%	98%	3%	1%	1%	1%
Asian females	98%	98%	2%	2%	0%	0%
Other	95%	99%	4%	1%	1%	0%

Illicit or Illegal Drug Use	0% - 25%		50%		75% - 100%	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
White males	29%	30%	34%	41%	37%	29%
White females	63%	57%	26%	30%	11%	13%
Black males	49%	41%	26%	27%	26%	32%
Black females	71%	65%	19%	22%	10%	14%
Hispanic/Latino males	61%	52%	23%	30%	16%	18%
Hispanic/Latino females	79%	70%	15%	21%	7%	8%
Asian males	95%	93%	3%	5%	2%	1%
Asian females	96%	95%	3%	4%	1%	1%
Other	96%	93%	2%	7%	1%	1%

Underage Alcohol Use	0% - 25%		50%		75% - 100%	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
White males	17%	19%	29%	34%	53%	47%
White females	40%	35%	33%	35%	28%	30%
Black males	50%	47%	24%	29%	26%	24%
Black females	66%	60%	22%	22%	13%	18%
Hispanic/Latino males	51%	53%	26%	24%	24%	23%
Hispanic/Latino females	67%	60%	19%	24%	14%	16%
Asian males	92%	87%	5%	7%	3%	6%
Asian females	94%	87%	4%	7%	2%	5%
Other	92%	93%	5%	6%	2%	2%

Shoplifting, Petty Theft or Stealing	0% - 25%		50%		75% - 100%	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
White males	49%	55%	28%	27%	23%	18%
White females	50%	48%	27%	30%	23%	22%
Black males	54%	46%	26%	31%	20%	23%
Black females	55%	50%	24%	26%	21%	24%
Hispanic/Latino males	71%	65%	20%	27%	10%	8%
Hispanic/Latino females	72%	67%	19%	22%	9%	11%
Asian males	95%	93%	4%	7%	1%	0%
Asian females	96%	93%	4%	6%	1%	0%
Other	94%	94%	5%	5%	1%	1%

Assault and Battery	0% - 25%		50%		75% - 100%	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
White males	38%	44%	30%	31%	32%	25%
White females	76%	70%	14%	22%	10%	9%
Black males	46%	36%	23%	29%	31%	35%
Black females	67%	56%	18%	21%	16%	23%
Hispanic/Latino males	54%	53%	23%	28%	22%	18%
Hispanic/Latino females	77%	70%	15%	20%	8%	10%
Asian males	95%	93%	3%	5%	1%	2%
Asian females	97%	95%	3%	4%	0%	0%
Other	96%	96%	4%	3%	1%	1%

## Rules/Procedures/Decision Making

How familiar are you with the concept of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system? n = 649	Prior to 2000 n=426	From 2000 to Date n=223
Not Familiar at All	49%	62%
Somewhat Familiar	37%	29%
Very Familiar	15%	9%

How familiar are your professional colleagues with the concept of DMC in the juvenile justice system? n = 648	Prior to 2000 n=426	From 2000 to Date n=222
Not Familiar at All	38%	47%
Somewhat Familiar	33%	26%
Very Familiar	8%	5%
Don't Know	21%	22%

Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC? n = 648	Prior to 2000 n=425	From 2000 to Date n=223
Yes	20%	15%
No	77%	78%
Don't Know	3%	7%

<b>If you have participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC, to what extent has your participation changed how you do your job? n = 420</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=264</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=156</b>
Not at All	71%	81%
Some	22%	18%
A Good Bit	7%	1%

<b>Do you believe that you are making different decisions towards the involved youth than you were before you participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC? n = 402</b>	<b>Prior to 2000 n=255</b>	<b>From 2000 to Date n=147</b>
Yes	15%	7%
No	85%	93%

Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings on juvenile offenders that addressed the following Evidence-based practices?	Yes		No		Not applicable to my position	
	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000	<2000	=>2000
Standardized risk and assessment tools	40%	29%	38%	49%	22%	22%
Clinical needs assessment tools	28%	21%	45%	54%	26%	25%
Standardized detention admission tools	32%	26%	43%	50%	25%	24%
Culturally sensitive offender services	31%	20%	47%	57%	22%	23%
Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)	38%	22%	40%	55%	21%	23%
Zero tolerance in schools	45%	30%	38%	50%	17%	20%
Any other?	6%	4%	67%	73%	27%	23%

Does your agency have any policy and procedures documentation that addresses DMC? n=639	Prior to 2000 n=419	From 2000 to Date n=220
Yes	13%	11%
No	59%	39%
Don't Know	28%	50%

Are the DMC policies and procedures followed within your agency? n=514	Prior to 2000 n=316	From 2000 to Date n=198
Not at All	16%	12%
Some	9%	6%
Completely	12%	8%
Don't Know	63%	75%

## Section 4: Survey Data Table 5

### Juvenile Justice Survey

#### Frequency Analysis of Responses – Grouped by three DMC Pilot Sites

- **Macon County**
- **Peoria County**
- **St. Clair County**

#### Notes:

- The overall survey responses from each of the counties represented were very small – each county being under 10 responses. Since the responses were small, no numbers will be displayed, only percentages. When looking at the data, we cannot state that the fact that these three counties were DMC pilot sites “created or caused” any increased DMC knowledge, DMC procedures, etc.; because it could have been happenstance. However, the DMC work that these DMC sites did “could” have had a positive impact.
- The survey data was not captured to be able to identify cities, towns or community areas; consequently, the other DMC pilot sites are not included within these data tables. However, they are included within the overall analysis data table.
- Percentages shown are rounded; therefore at times the total percentages may be slightly lower or higher than 100%.

## Demographics

Current occupation	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
IDJJ	0%	0%	0%
Detention/Probation	20%	0%	14%
Judge/SAO/PD	20%	25%	0%
Police/Law Enforcement	40%	75%	86%
Other	20%	0%	0%

Year began working in current field	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Prior to 2000	60%	50%	100%
2000 -2004	20%	13%	0%
2005 -2009	20%	25%	0%
2010 – present	0%	13%	0%

Retired	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Yes	0%	0%	14%
No	100%	100%	86%

Year began working for current employer	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Prior to 2000	80%	50%	29%
2000-2005	0%	25%	43%
2006 - Present	20%	26%	28%

Age	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
<20	0%	0%	0%
20-25	0%	0%	0%
26-30	0%	0%	0%
31-35	20%	14%	14%
36-40	0%	0%	14%
41-45	20%	29%	0%
46-50	0%	29%	14%
51-55	40%	14%	29%
56-60	0%	14%	29%
61-65	20%	0%	0%
>65	0%	0%	0%

Ethnicity	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Hispanic	0%	0%	0%
Non-Hispanic	100%	100%	100%

Race	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Black/African American	0%	0%	0%
White/Caucasian	100%	100%	86%
Asian	0%	0%	0%
Native American or Native Alaskan	0%	0%	14%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%
Multi-racial	0%	0%	0%
Other (Hispanic, Mexican and Mexican American were written in)	0%	0%	0%

Gender	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Male	50%	63%	86%
Female	50%	38%	14%

Highest level of Education	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
High School	0%	0%	14%
Technical Vocational School	0%	0%	0%
Some college	0%	38%	14%
College graduate	50%	38%	57%
Graduate school	50%	25%	14%

How closely do the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Few minorities in my agency	60%	38%	71%
More minorities in my agency	20%	0%	14%
About the same	20%	50%	14%
Don't Know	0%	13%	0%

## Interaction with Juveniles

How do you typically determine the age of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
I ask them their age	60%	63%	86%
I look at their driver's license and determine their age	40%	50%	57%
I look them up on my computer	40%	25%	14%
Other	60%	13%	0%

How do you typically determine the ethnicity/race of a person when you stop or interact with a person? (Select all that apply)	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
I ask them their ethnicity/race	40%	38%	57%
I look at their driver's license and determine their ethnicity/race	20%	38%	57%
I look them up on my computer	20%	25%	14%
Other	40%	25%	29%

Do you report the ethnicity/race of the juvenile?	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Yes	60%	33%	71%
No	40%	50%	14%
Don't Know	0%	17%	14%

## Perceptions/Social Conditions

M = Macon County Responses

P= Peoria County Responses

S = St. Clair County Responses

In my community...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree			Don't Know			Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
The juvenile court is too lenient	40%	100%	86%	0%	0%	14%	60%	0%	0%
Youth are arrested for many things that should be handled by their parents	100%	63%	29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	38%	71%
Police are tougher on people of color (non-whites)	50%	0%	14%	25%	0%	0%	25%	100%	86%
Police tend to treat poor people and rich people differently	60%	38%	57%	0%	13%	14%	40%	50%	29%
People with high income get better legal advice and representation than people with low income	100%	63%	57%	0%	25%	14%	0%	13%	29%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be arrested by police, even for similar behavior	60%	0%	0%	0%	13%	29%	40%	88%	71%
The juvenile court is too punitive	20%	0%	0%	20%	25%	43%	60%	75%	57%
Juvenile courts need to employ more people of color	60%	0%	0%	40%	86%	57%	0%	14%	43%
The court treats native English speakers better than people with little or no English	20%	0%	14%	80%	38%	43%	0%	63%	43%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be transferred to adult court, even for similar charges	40%	0%	14%	20%	13%	43%	40%	88%	43%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be adjudicated in court, even for similar charges.	80%	13%	14%	20%	0%	43%	0%	88%	43%
People of color are reluctant to stand up for their legal rights in court	40%	0%	29%	20%	0%	14%	40%	100%	57%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be prosecuted by the justice system, even for similar charges	40%	0%	14%	20%	25%	43%	40%	75%	43%
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be confined by the justice system, even for similar charges	40%	0%	29%	20%	25%	14%	40%	75%	57%

M = Macon County Responses

P= Peoria County Responses

S = St. Clair County Responses

I trust the following groups to deal with juveniles in the justice system fairly	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree			Don't Know			Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
Corrections Staff	20%	88%	100%	20%	13%	0%	60%	0%	0%
Detention Staff	40%	88%	100%	0%	13%	0%	60%	0%	0%
Judges and other court personnel	80%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%
Police and other law enforcement personnel	60%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%	40%	0%	0%
Probation Officers and other law enforcement personnel	80%	88%	100%	0%	13%	0%	20%	0%	0%
Social Service agencies	100%	88%	71%	0%	13%	14%	0%	0%	14%
Prosecutors and other State's Attorney personnel	60%	100%	100%	20%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%
Public Defenders and other Public Defender personnel	80%	88%	71%	0%	13%	14%	20%	0%	14%
Teachers and other school officials	40%	75%	86%	0%	25%	0%	60%	0%	14%

M = Macon County Responses

P= Peoria County Responses

S = St. Clair County Responses

The way juveniles are handled by the justice system is influenced by the juvenile's...	Strongly Agree/Somewhat Agree			Don't Know			Somewhat Disagree/Strongly Disagree		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
Ability to speak English	40%	13%	43%	20%	38%	14%	40%	50%	43%
Access to social services	60%	25%	43%	20%	38%	29%	20%	38%	29%
Age	100%	38%	71%	0%	25%	14%	0%	38%	14%
Community's attitudes towards youth	60%	38%	43%	20%	0%	29%	20%	63%	29%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	80%	13%	43%	0%	13%	0%	20%	75%	57%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	100%	75%	71%	0%	0%	14%	0%	25%	14%
Family connections	80%	38%	29%	0%	13%	43%	20%	50%	29%
Family living situation	60%	75%	57%	20%	13%	43%	20%	13%	0%
Gang affiliation	100%	50%	86%	0%	13%	14%	0%	38%	0%
Gender	80%	25%	29%	20%	0%	43%	0%	75%	29%
General demeanor and appearance	100%	50%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
History of violence behavior	100%	88%	86%	0%	0%	14%	0%	13%	0%
Intelligence	60%	25%	43%	20%	25%	43%	20%	50%	14%
Local culture	60%	25%	57%	20%	13%	29%	20%	63%	14%
Mental health issues	60%	88%	100%	0%	0%	0%	40%	13%	0%
Record of prior offenses	100%	88%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%
Parent's attitudes	60%	50%	86%	20%	0%	14%	20%	50%	0%
Parent's involvement	60%	63%	86%	20%	0%	14%	20%	38%	0%
Religion	0%	25%	0%	0%	13%	29%	100%	63%	71%
Sexual Orientation	0%	13%	0%	20%	13%	29%	80%	75%	71%
Socio-economic status	60%	13%	29%	20%	13%	29%	20%	75%	43%
Stereotypes	60%	13%	0%	0%	13%	43%	40%	75%	57%
Success in school	60%	63%	57%	0%	13%	14%	40%	25%	29%

M = Macon County Responses

P= Peoria County Responses

S = St. Clair County Responses

Have you seen any discrimination of youth in the juvenile justice system that involved the juvenile's...	YES			NO		
	M	P	S	M	P	S
Ability to speak English	0%	0%	14%	100%	100%	86%
Age	0%	0%	29%	100%	100%	71%
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	60%	0%	14%	40%	100%	86%
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	60%	0%	29%	40%	100%	71%
Family connections	40%	0%	29%	60%	100%	71%
Family living situation	60%	0%	14%	40%	100%	86%
Gang affiliation	80%	13%	14%	20%	88%	86%
Gender	20%	13%	0%	80%	88%	100%
General demeanor and appearance	60%	13%	14%	40%	88%	86%
History of violence behavior	80%	13%	14%	20%	88%	86%
Intelligence	20%	0%	14%	80%	100%	86%
Local culture	60%	0%	14%	40%	100%	86%
Mental health issues	20%	0%	14%	80%	100%	86%
Record of prior offenses	80%	25%	14%	20%	75%	86%
Parent's attitudes	80%	13%	29%	20%	88%	71%
Parent's involvement	60%	25%	14%	40%	75%	86%
Religion	0%	0%	14%	100%	100%	86%
Sexual Orientation	0%	0%	14%	100%	100%	86%
Socio-economic status	60%	0%	14%	40%	100%	86%

M = Macon County Responses

P= Peoria County Responses

S = St. Clair County Responses

At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?	None			A Little			A Good Bit			Don't Know		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
Initial police contact	20%	0%	14%	0%	0%	57%	80%	100%	29%	0%	0%	0%
Station Adjustment	0%	0%	14%	40%	29%	43%	60%	71%	43%	0%	0%	0%
Arrest	0%	0%	14%	60%	14%	43%	40%	86%	43%	0%	0%	0%
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	40%	14%	0%	20%	0%	57%	20%	43%	43%	20%	43%	0%
Detention Hearing	0%	14%	0%	0%	29%	43%	60%	29%	57%	40%	29%	0%
Detention staff in a Detention facility	0%	14%	29%	0%	0%	29%	20%	29%	43%	80%	57%	0%
Delinquency Petition	0%	14%	0%	20%	14%	71%	60%	43%	29%	20%	29%	0%
Adjudication Hearing	0%	14%	0%	20%	29%	71%	40%	29%	29%	40%	29%	0%
Probation	0%	14%	0%	0%	14%	57%	60%	29%	43%	40%	43%	0%
Sentencing Hearing	0%	14%	0%	0%	14%	43%	80%	29%	57%	20%	43%	0%
Juvenile justice staff in a juvenile justice facility	0%	14%	14%	0%	0%	43%	0%	29%	43%	100%	57%	0%
Aftercare (Parole) staff	0%	14%	0%	0%	14%	57%	20%	29%	43%	80%	43%	0%

**Survey Questions 15A – 15F**

Juvenile crime and delinquency is relatively common in most communities as youth struggle with the transition to childhood through adolescence and into young adulthood. To better understand perceptions with different groups of juveniles, we would like to know the gender, race, and ethnicity of the juveniles you encounter in your position. Based on your observations and experience as a police officer, probation officer, etc., in your current community, how would you estimate the percentage of youth for the following gender, race and ethnic groups (ages 10-17) that are committing status offenses, delinquent and other criminal acts in each group and subgroup? Select the closest percentage provided.

**M = Macon County Responses**

**P= Peoria County Responses**

**S = St. Clair County Responses**

Status offenses (e.g., curfew violations, runaways, etc.)	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
White males	20%	25%	29%	80%	38%	57%	0%	38%	14%
White females	60%	75%	71%	40%	13%	29%	0%	13%	0%
Black males	60%	50%	57%	40%	25%	14%	0%	25%	29%
Black females	80%	88%	71%	20%	13%	14%	0%	0%	14%
Hispanic/Latino males	100%	75%	67%	0%	13%	17%	0%	13%	17%
Hispanic/Latino females	100%	88%	83%	0%	13%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Asian males	100%	75%	83%	0%	13%	17%	0%	13%	0%
Asian females	100%	88%	100%	0%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	100%	86%	100%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Vandalism or Property Crimes	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
White males	20%	14%	43%	40%	57%	29%	40%	29%	29%
White females	100%	86%	86%	0%	14%	14%	0%	0%	0%
Black males	25%	43%	67%	25%	29%	0%	50%	29%	33%
Black females	100%	86%	86%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	14%
Hispanic/Latino males	100%	71%	67%	0%	14%	33%	0%	14%	0%
Hispanic/Latino females	100%	86%	83%	0%	14%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Asian males	100%	71%	83%	0%	14%	17%	0%	14%	0%
Asian females	100%	86%	83%	0%	14%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Other	100%	75%	100%	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%

M = Macon County Responses

P= Peoria County Responses

S = St. Clair County Responses

Illicit or Illegal Drug Use	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
White males	40%	29%	29%	60%	43%	43%	0%	29%	29%
White females	50%	71%	57%	50%	29%	29%	0%	0%	14%
Black males	50%	57%	33%	0%	43%	33%	50%	0%	33%
Black females	67%	86%	33%	33%	14%	50%	0%	0%	17%
Hispanic/Latino males	100%	71%	67%	0%	29%	33%	0%	0%	0%
Hispanic/Latino females	100%	86%	83%	0%	14%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Asian males	100%	86%	83%	0%	14%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Asian females	100%	83%	83%	0%	17%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Other	100%	67%	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Underage Alcohol Use	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
White males	20%	0%	14%	60%	57%	29%	20%	43%	57%
White females	20%	29%	43%	60%	57%	29%	20%	14%	29%
Black males	67%	43%	33%	33%	43%	33%	0%	14%	33%
Black females	100%	71%	50%	0%	29%	33%	0%	0%	17%
Hispanic/Latino males	50%	71%	67%	50%	14%	17%	0%	14%	17%
Hispanic/Latino females	50%	86%	83%	50%	14%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Asian males	100%	86%	67%	0%	14%	17%	0%	0%	17%
Asian females	100%	86%	83%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Other	100%	67%	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%

M = Macon County Responses

P= Peoria County Responses

S = St. Clair County Responses

Shoplifting, Petty Theft or Stealing	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
White males	100%	43%	43%	0%	43%	29%	0%	14%	29%
White females	20%	71%	86%	60%	29%	14%	20%	0%	0%
Black males	100%	43%	50%	0%	57%	17%	0%	0%	33%
Black females	25%	71%	50%	50%	29%	33%	25%	0%	17%
Hispanic/Latino males	100%	71%	67%	0%	29%	17%	0%	0%	17%
Hispanic/Latino females	100%	86%	67%	0%	14%	17%	0%	0%	17%
Asian males	100%	71%	83%	0%	29%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Asian females	100%	86%	83%	0%	14%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Other	0%	67%	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Assault and Battery	0% - 25%			50%			75% - 100%		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
White males	60%	29%	43%	20%	57%	14%	20%	14%	43%
White females	100%	71%	83%	0%	29%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Black males	25%	29%	43%	50%	57%	29%	25%	14%	29%
Black females	50%	71%	50%	0%	29%	50%	50%	0%	0%
Hispanic/Latino males	100%	71%	67%	0%	29%	17%	0%	0%	17%
Hispanic/Latino females	100%	86%	83%	0%	14%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Asian males	100%	71%	83%	0%	29%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Asian females	100%	86%	83%	0%	14%	17%	0%	0%	0%
Other	100%	67%	100%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%

## Rules/Procedures/Decision Making

How familiar are you with the concept of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system?	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Not Familiar at All	20%	88%	No response
Somewhat Familiar	0%	13%	No response
Very Familiar	80%	0%	No response

How familiar are your professional colleagues with the concept of DMC in the juvenile justice system?	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Not Familiar at All	20%	38%	57%
Somewhat Familiar	40%	13%	29%
Very Familiar	40%	0%	0%
Don't Know	0%	50%	14%

Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Yes	80%	0%	14%
No	20%	88%	71%
Don't Know	0%	13%	14%

<b>If you have participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC, to what extent has your participation changed how you do your job?</b>	<b>Macon County</b>	<b>Peoria County</b>	<b>St. Clair County</b>
Not at All	0%	75%	80%
Some	75%	25%	0%
A Good Bit	25%	0%	20%

<b>Do you believe that you are making different decisions towards the involved youth than you were before you participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?</b>	<b>Macon County</b>	<b>Peoria County</b>	<b>St. Clair County</b>
Yes	40%	20%	20%
No	60%	80%	80%

M = Macon County Responses

P= Peoria County Responses

S = St. Clair County Responses

Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings on juvenile offenders that addressed the following Evidence-based practices?	Yes			No			Not applicable to my position		
	M	P	S	M	P	S	M	P	S
Standardized risk and assessment tools	60%	0%	14%	40%	63%	86%	0%	38%	0%
Clinical needs assessment tools	60%	0%	14%	40%	63%	86%	0%	38%	0%
Standardized detention admission tools	80%	13%	29%	20%	50%	71%	0%	38%	0%
Culturally sensitive offender services	60%	0%	14%	40%	57%	86%	0%	43%	0%
Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)	80%	0%	14%	20%	63%	86%	0%	38%	0%
Zero tolerance in schools	60%	25%	57%	40%	50%	43%	0%	25%	0%
Any other?	50%	0%	0%	50%	67%	100%	0%	33%	0%

Does your agency have any policy and procedures documentation that addresses DMC?	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Yes	0%	0%	0%
No	100%	38%	86%
Don't Know	0%	63%	14%

Are the DMC policies and procedures followed within your agency?	Macon County	Peoria County	St. Clair County
Not at All	0%	0%	0%
Some	0%	0%	0%
Completely	0%	0%	0%
Don't Know	100%	100%	100%

# ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Center for Prevention Research & Development,  
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign

## Annotated Bibliography

The annotated references to scholarly articles, book chapters, and reports below were collected in 2012 and reflect subject and keyword searches on the Ebsco database of databases, references in selected articles, and articles citing already selected articles; GoogleScholar was also used for the two follow-up search strategies. In addition, reports were accessed from the OJJDP and W. Haywood Burns Institute websites.

These articles address:

1. General issues pertaining to DMC theory, prevention policies, and evaluation, especially insofar as researchers have established the vital role of the juvenile justice system in DMC.
2. Sociological explanations of DMC relating to both larger social context and the juvenile justice system, with race/ethnicity as pervasive factors in shaping behavior, interactions, and decision making.
3. Specific references to OJJDP decision points regarding their contribution in complex and interrelated ways to DMC.

### 1. DMC Theory, Prevention Policies, and Evaluation

#### Differential offending vs. differential treatment

1. Bishop, D. M. (2005). The role of race and ethnicity in juvenile justice processing. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children* (pp. 23-82). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

*... while there is some truth to the “differential offending” and “differential treatment” arguments, there is also truth that lies beyond and between these points, in the politico-legal climate responsible for lawmaking and its enforcement, and in the conditions and circumstances that at once place youths at risk for delinquency and also provide the rationale for juvenile justice intervention.*

2. Kakade, M., Duarte, C. S., Liu, X., Fuller, C. J., Drucker, E., Hoven, C. W., et al. (2012). Adolescent substance use and other illegal behaviors and racial disparities in criminal justice system involvement: Findings from a US national survey. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*(7), 1307-1310.

*We used data from a national survey (NLSY1997-2003) to examine arrest rate disparities between African American and White adolescents (aged 12-17 years; n = 6725) in relation to drug-related and other illegal behaviors. African American adolescents were less likely than Whites to have engaged in drug use or drug selling, but were more likely to have been arrested. Racial disparities in adolescent arrest appear to result from differential treatment of minority youths*

*and to have long-term negative effects on the lives of affected African American youths.*

3. Piquero, A. R. (2008). Disproportionate minority contact. *The Future of Children*, 18(2), 59-79.  
*Some analysts attribute the disparities to "differential involvement"--that is, to differences in offending by minorities and whites. Others attribute them to "differential selection" ... Future research should thus move beyond the debate over "which one matters more" and seek to understand how each of these two hypotheses can explain both the fact of minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system and how best to address it.*

#### **Juvenile justice systemic contribution to DMC**

4. Bell, J., & Ridolfi, L. J. (2008). *Adoration of the questions: Reflections on the failure to reduce racial & ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system*. San Francisco, CA: W. Haywood Burns Institute.  
*Forward movement in the field is obstructed by the constant and misdirected citation of extrajudicial factors as the only causes contributing to disparities. Worse yet, such an excuse leads to the reduction of racial and ethnic disparities being viewed as an intractable problem, resulting in confusion about solutions and paralysis around the issue of disparities reduction found in many jurisdictions today.*
5. Hanes, M. (2012). *OJJDP in focus: Disproportionate minority contact*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs.  
*In most jurisdictions, disproportionate juvenile minority representation is not limited only to secure detention and confinement; it is evident at nearly all contact points on the juvenile justice system continuum. Contributing factors to DMC are multiple and complex; reducing DMC requires comprehensive and multipronged strategies that include programmatic and systems change efforts.*
6. Leiber, M., & Rodriguez, N. (2011). The implementation of the disproportionate minority Confinement/Contact (DMC) mandate. *Race and Justice*, 1(1), 103-124.  
*Although we agree with many aspects of the development of a broader inquiry into the factors associated with both differential offending and selection bias, we see merit as well with the underlying sentiments of the Burns Institute. That is, states and localities will more often focus on the youth themselves or their families, and their conditions, rather than assess how policies within the system may work to disadvantage some groups relative to others.*

#### **Promising practices**

7. Cabaniss, E. R., Frabutt, J. M., Kendrick, M. H., & Arbuckle, M. B. (2007). Reducing disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system: Promising practices. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12(4), 393-401.

*Common practices and emerging strategies for effectively lowering DMC rates include: (a) data review and decision-point mapping; (b) cultural competency training; (c) increasing community-based detention alternatives; (d) removing decision-making subjectivity; (e) reducing barriers to family involvement; and (f) cultivating state leadership to legislate system-level change.*

#### **Data collection**

8. Kempf-Leonard, K. (2007). Minority youths and juvenile justice: Disproportionate minority contact after nearly 20 years of reform efforts. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 5(1), 71-87.

*There is persuasive evidence that identifying where disparities exist and isolating the reasons for these differences require considerably more information and of higher quality than routinely exists in available sources data.*

9. Nellis, A., & Richardson, B. (2010). Getting beyond failure: Promising approaches for reducing DMC. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 8(3), 266-276.

*The routine and systematic collection of data is widely accepted as a key component for successful efforts to reduce DMC. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention emphasizes the importance of collecting and analyzing individual-level data from nine decision points in the juvenile justice system: arrest, referral to court, diversion, secure detention, petition (charges filed), delinquent findings, probation, confinement in secure correctional facilities, and transfer to adult court. Other data points may be instructive as well, such as police referral data from the schools.*

#### **Community-based risk/protective prevention efforts**

10. Chapman, J. F., Desai, R. A., Falzer, P. R., & Borum, R. (2006). Violence risk and race in a sample of youth in juvenile detention the potential to reduce disproportionate minority confinement. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 170-184.

*Program development targeting low-risk African American youth that seeks to capitalize on identified protective factors may be quite helpful and become an effective strategy for community-based programs. This would not only assist program development but may provide jurisdictions with opportunities to decrease DMC, thereby creating a fairer system and complying with federal mandates.*

#### **Minority representation among juvenile justice professionals**

11. Ward, G., Kupchik, A., Parker, L., & Starks, B. C. (2011). Racial politics of juvenile justice policy support. *Race and Justice*, 1(2), 154-184.

*... racial politics of probation officers and court contexts may impede or promote local responses to the DMC Mandate; minority representation within the courtroom workforce is an important source of DMC Mandate support.*

*... prior research suggests that stereotyping and discrimination disadvantage non-White youth in juvenile court organizations. These racial politics may be contingent on the balance of racial group representation among juvenile court personnel. ... there is evidence that minority representation among juvenile court personnel increases sensitivity to issues of justice system accountability, such as system fairness, and that greater racial group balance in representation among court authorities relates to greater racial parity in outcomes.*

#### **Local emphasis of prevention efforts**

12. Pope, C. E., & Leiber, M. J. (2005). Disproportionate minority Confinement/Contact (DMC): The federal initiative. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children: Confronting racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice*. (pp. 351-389). Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press.

*The primary focus for examining the existence of disproportionate minority confinement, factors contributing to it, and subsequent planning and implementing of specific strategies and actions to address related issues must be the local jurisdiction and the local community. Therefore, suggested mechanisms for local planning and actions should be developed.*

#### **Prevention results**

13. Davis, J., & Sorensen, J. R. (2010). Disproportionate minority confinement of juveniles: A national examination of Black–White disparity in placements, 1997-2006. *Crime & Delinquency* (online), March 2010.

*... findings suggest that, on average, there has been a reduction of nearly one fifth in the disproportionate Black:White ratio of juvenile placements, controlling for the groups' rate of arrests during the past decade.*

#### **Evaluation: qualitative**

14. Pope, C. E., Lovell, R., & Hsia, H. M. (2002). *Disproportionate minority confinement: A review of the research literature from 1989 through 2001*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

*An adequate explanation for disproportionality is not possible without complementary qualitative approaches. Interviews, focus groups, town hall meetings, and/or other techniques are necessary to develop an explanation as to why officials in one jurisdiction focus on formal processing of youth while officials in another jurisdiction use informal alternatives to deal with similarly situated youth.*

#### **Evaluation: outside & local**

15. Nellis, A. M. (2005). *Seven steps to develop and evaluate strategies to reduce disproportionate minority contact (DMC)*. Washington, D.C.: Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center.

... while many projects charged with identifying and reducing DMC will want to consider hiring an outside evaluator to complete a formal evaluation of their strategies, basic knowledge about evaluation and performance measurement issues as they relate to minority overrepresentation is essential for all staff working on a DMC project.

## **2. Sociological Explanations of DMC: Social Context, Juvenile Justice System, and Race**

### **Race/institutionalized racism**

16. Krisberg, B.A. (2005). Foreword. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children* (pp. vii-x). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

*Unless you think race is a purely genetic factor (an idea that biologists discredit), then race is expressed in other social, economic, cultural, and psychological factors. ... So when analyses show that "other variables" reduce the variance explained by race, they simply identifying the intervening variables through which race effects life outcomes. That the researchers find any residual race effect at all suggests to me that they have not measured all the pertinent intervening factors, or that they have inexactly measured another factor that I would call racism.*

### **Race/attributional stereotypes – symbolic threat**

17. Bray, T. M., Sample, L. L., & Kempf-Leonard, K. (2005). "Justice by geography": Racial disparity and juvenile courts. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children: Confronting racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice*. (pp. 270-299). Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press.

*In distinguishing among defendants and their crimes, court officials make evaluations about the character, motivations, and background of defendants. Based on these evaluations, some defendants are perceived as more excusable than others, while others are viewed as more blameworthy and deserving of punishment. Officials' perceptions, then, are a critical theoretical link in explaining the relationship between defendant characteristics and case dispositions.*

18. Bridges, G. S., & Steen, S. (1998). Racial disparities in official assessments of juvenile offenders: Attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms. *American Sociological Review*, 63(4), 554-570.

*Insofar as officials judge black youths to be more dangerous than white youths, they do so because they attribute crime by blacks to negative personalities or their attitudinal traits and because black offenders are more likely than white offenders to have committed serious offenses and have histories of prior involvement in crime. Our analysis combines information from probation*

*officers' written accounts of juvenile offenders and their crimes and court records about the offenders. We find pronounced differences in probation officers' attributions about the causes of crime by white versus minority youths. Further, these differences contribute significantly to differential assessments of the risk of reoffending and to sentence recommendations, even after adjusting for legally relevant case and offender characteristics. These results suggest that differential attributions about the causes of crime act as a mediating factor between race and sentencing recommendations.*

19. Harris, A. (2009). Attributions and institutional processing: How focal concerns guide decision-making in the juvenile court. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(4), 243-256.

*Guided by their organizational priorities of determining the extent of youths' blameworthiness and the extent to which they are a threat to community safety, probation officers read and processed case and individual-level information into attributional stories about reasons for offending. These narratives described youth as either being amenable or not to the services of the juvenile justice system. The narratives became legal evidence that supported the outcome decisions. Key to these attributions were notions of dangerousness and sophistication, which were assumed to be permanent traits embedded in youths' character. Also assumed was that probation officers had the skills and predictive power to assess and label youths' character and future behavior based on social and legal histories and police reports found in youths' institutional files. It is important to note the lack of statistical or qualitative differences in the ways that the attributions were applied to black and Latino youth. In fact, it seemed that probation officers had consistent scripts that were guided by their focal concerns.*

20. Leiber, M. J., & Johnson, J. D. (2008). Being young and black: What are their effects on juvenile justice decision making? *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(4), 560-581.

*Using an interpretation of the symbolic threat thesis and the emphasis on stereotyping as the theoretical framework, we discovered that being Black and older increased a youth's chances of receiving an intake court referral and decreased the odds of participation in intake diversion. Age did not condition intake decision making for African Americans but was discovered to temper case outcomes for Whites ... the age discount applied more to Whites than to African Americans.*

21. Leiber, M. J., Johnson, J., Fox, K., & Lacks, R. (2007). Differentiating among racial/ethnic groups and its implications for understanding juvenile justice decision making. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(5), 471-484.

*... linkages to segregation, family disruption and subcultural adaptations (i.e., shadow cultures, codes of the streets) with social isolation (lack of sustained interaction with individuals and institutions from mainstream society) will most*

*likely continue to develop and foster stereotypes that shape decision makers perceptions of minorities as “threatening” and increase the likelihood of state intervention ...*

#### **Early police contact – family/adults/peers**

22. Crutchfield, R. D., Skinner, M. L., Haggerty, K. P., McGlynn, A., & Catalano, R. F. (2009). Racial disparities in early criminal justice involvement. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(4), 218.

*... in addition to being male and living in a low-income family, children who have parents who have a history of arrest, who have experienced school disciplinary actions, who have delinquent peers, and who are in networks with deviant adults are more likely to have problems with law enforcement. These factors help to explain racial differences in police contacts and arrests.*

#### **School-to-prison pipeline**

23. Fenning, P., & Rose, J. (2007). Overrepresentation of African American students in exclusionary discipline: The role of school policy. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 536-559.

*The overrepresentation of ethnic minority students, particularly African American males, in the exclusionary discipline consequences of suspension and expulsion has been consistently documented during the past three decades. Children of poverty and those with academic problems are also overrepresented in such discipline consequences. Sadly, a direct link between these exclusionary discipline consequences and entrance to prison has been documented and termed the school-to-prison pipeline for these most vulnerable students. In this article, the authors argue that ethnographic and interview data would support teachers' perceptions of loss of classroom control (and accompanying fear) as contributing to who is labeled and removed for discipline reasons (largely poor students of color). Exclusionary discipline consequences are the primary medium used once students are sent from the classroom.*

24. Hirschfield, P. J. (2008). Preparing for prison?: The criminalization of school discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12(1), 79.

*American schools increasingly define and manage the problem of student discipline through a prism of crime control. Most theoretical explanations fail to situate school criminalization in a broader structural context, to fully explain its spatio-temporal variations, and to specify the processes and subjectivities that mediate between structural and legal forces and the behavior of school actors. A multilevel structural model of school criminalization is developed which posits that a troubled domestic economy, the mass unemployment and incarceration of disadvantaged minorities, and resulting fiscal crises in urban public education have shifted school disciplinary policies and practices and staff perceptions of*

*poor students of color in a manner that promotes greater punishment and exclusion of students perceived to be on a criminal justice 'track'.*

25. Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *Urban Review*, 34(4), 317.

*The disproportionate discipline of African-American students has been extensively documented; yet the reasons for those disparities are less well understood. Drawing upon one year of middle-school disciplinary data for an urban school district, we explored three of the most commonly offered hypotheses for disproportionate discipline based on gender, race, and socioeconomic status. Racial and gender disparities in office referrals, suspensions, and expulsions were somewhat more robust than socioeconomic differences. Both racial and gender differences remained when controlling for socioeconomic status. Finally, although evidence emerged that boys engage more frequently in a broad range of disruptive behavior, there were no similar findings for race. Rather, there appeared to be a differential pattern of treatment, originating at the classroom level, wherein African-American students are referred to the office for infractions that are more subjective in interpretation. Implications for teacher training and structural reform are explored.*

#### **Poverty and race**

26. Armstrong, G. S., & Rodriguez, N. (2005). Effects of individual and contextual characteristics on preadjudication detention of juvenile delinquents. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(4), 521-539.

*Our study found that counties with a higher percentage of non-White population were more likely to detain juvenile delinquents prior to adjudication. These findings demonstrate the importance of considering both individual and contextual factors of jurisdictions when examining the adjudication process.*

27. Kirk, D. S. (2008). The neighborhood context of racial and ethnic disparities in arrest. *Demography*, 45(1), 55-77.

*At the family level, results show that disadvantages in the form of unstable family structures explain much of the disparities in arrest across race and ethnicity. At the neighborhood level, black youths tend to reside in areas with both significantly higher levels of concentrated poverty than other youths as well as lower levels of collective efficacy than white youths. ... Even after accounting for relevant demographic, family, and neighborhood-level predictors, substantial residual arrest differences remain between black youths and youths of other racial and ethnic groups.*

## Mental illness and racial disparity

28. Desai, R. A., Falzer, P. R., Chapman, J., & Borum, R. (2012). Mental illness, violence risk, and race in juvenile detention: Implications for disproportionate minority contact. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 82(1), 32-40.

*DMC in these data was not explained by mental illness, seriousness of charges, violence risk, age, or gender. We suggest that mandated efforts to reduce DMC will need to address more than improving behavior or reducing symptoms of mental illness among detained minority youth. Instead, efforts should be focused on reducing the racial disparity evident in decisions made within the juvenile justice system.*

## 3. Juvenile justice (OJJDP) decision points

### General

29. Miller, J.G. (1996) *Search and Destroy: African-American Males in the Criminal Justice System*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

*I learned very early on that when we got an African American youth, virtually everything from arrest summaries, to family history, to rap sheets, to psychiatric exams was skewed. If a middle-class white youth was sent to us as "dangerous," he was more likely actually to be so than an African American teenager given the same label. The white teenager was more likely to have been afforded competent legal counsel and appropriate psychiatric and psychological testing, tried in a variety of privately funded options, and dealt with more sensitively and individually at every stage of the juvenile justice processing. For him to be labeled "dangerous" he had to have done something very serious indeed.*

30. Leiber, M. J., & Mack, K. Y. (2003). The individual and joint effects of race, gender, and family status on juvenile justice decision-making. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(1), 34-70.

*The first theme to emerge is that African Americans receive outcomes involving both harshness and leniency compared to Whites, and for the most part, these decisions are not influenced by gender or family status. African Americans, for example, are more likely than their White counterparts at intake to be referred on for further court processing. At intake, African Americans are also more likely to be released than participate in diversion when compared to White youth. ... Although it is not apparent why family status did not play a more significant role in decision-making for African Americans, one possibility is that decision-makers view the African American family as problematic or dysfunctional regardless of the structure that it takes.*

31. Leiber, M. J., & Jamieson, K. M. (1995). Race and decision making in juvenile justice: The importance of context. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11(4), 363-384.

*It is at intake, initial appearance, and judicial disposition that personal discretion is greatest. It was at these stages that stereotyping, structural factors, and ultimately, racial selection biases were, for the most part, operative. Conversely, discretion is exercised less often at petition and adjudication, where legal criteria were most influential in determining case outcomes. The effects of race and the contextual variables were also less evident here. ... Lenient outcomes for minority youth at one stage, for example, may reflect a correction factor on the part of decision makers to offset previous injustices.*

32. McCarter, S. (2009). Legal and extralegal factors affecting minority overrepresentation in Virginia's juvenile justice system: A mixed-method study. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 26(6), 533-544.

*Three-fourths of the juvenile justice professionals said that disparity existed in processing and sanctions for African American and Caucasian males. Further, whereas most of the professional respondents (diversion n = 19; incarceration n = 24) cited the legal factors of crime severity and prior record as most predictive of diversion and incarceration, half of the youth and their parents thought the extralegal factor of race affected both diversion and incarceration. Several professionals cited family structure as a contributing factor yet no parents or youth cited family structure and neither logistic regression suggested an effect of family structure on diversion or incarceration.*

33. Rodriguez, N. (2007): Juvenile Court Context and Detention Decisions: Reconsidering the Role of Race, Ethnicity, and Community Characteristics in Juvenile Court Processes, *Justice Quarterly*, 24:4, 629-656

*Arrests by law enforcement showed significant black youth overrepresentation yet preadjudication detention decisions showed white youth treated more severely than black youth. This finding is particularly relevant since the preadjudication detention decision is absent of prosecutorial review where a case might be "corrected" for being "weak." This implies judges as early as during the preadjudication detention phase may be making decisions that counter or "correct" the overrepresentation of minority youth at the arrest and referral stage.*

### **Cumulative disproportion**

34. Kakar, S. (2006). Understanding the causes of disproportionate minority contact: Results of focus group discussions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(4), 369-381.

In 1997–98, African American youth represented 15 percent of the total youth population, but 26 percent of the youth arrested, 31 percent of the youth referred to juvenile court, 44 percent of the youth detained, 46 percent of the

youth judicially waived to criminal court, and 58 percent of the youth admitted to state prison.

### **Police/juvenile interactions – African American perceptions**

35. Brunson, R. K. (2007). Police don't like black people?: African-American young men's accumulated police experiences. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 6(1), 71-101.  
*Study findings highlight the value of using comprehensive and nuanced measures of police/citizen encounters and underscore the importance of examining the impact of accumulated adverse experiences.*
36. Brunson, R. K., & Miller, J. (2006). Young black men and urban policing in the United States. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(4), 613-640.  
*Our findings highlight young men's sense of themselves as symbolic assailants in the eyes of the police, suggest the importance of measuring the impact of accumulated negative experiences to better understand minority/police relations, and add additional currency to recent findings on the significance of procedural justice.*
37. Brunson, R. K., & Weitzer, R. (2009). Police relations with black and white youths in different urban neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(6), 858-885.  
*Black respondents expressed hopelessness regarding the situation because they felt that officers would never see them as anything other than symbolic assailants, even when they were engaged in entirely lawful activity. Both Black and White youth reported having adverse experiences with the police, yet Blacks appear to be treated poorly no matter where they live. In other words, for Black youth, race appears to be a "master status" that trumps ecological context.*
38. Hurst, Y. G., Frank, J., & Browning, S. L. (2000). The attitudes of juveniles toward the police: A comparison of black and white youth. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(1), 37-53.  
*It appears that actual contact focuses the juveniles' attention on specific behavior and not overall perceptions of the police. Cultural perspectives may be less likely to be cognitively accessed in these situations. Black and white juvenile respondents appear to start at the same point when rating officer performance in these situations.*
39. Schuck, A. M., Rosenbaum, D. P., & Hawkins, D. F. (2008). The influence of Race/Ethnicity, social class, and neighborhood context on residents' attitudes toward the police. *Police Quarterly*, 11(4), 496-519.  
*According to the vicarious experience model, residents' perceptions of the police are shaped through the exchange of information and observations about police-resident encounters. Embedded in this perspective is the assertion that attitudes*

*are not formed necessarily on the basis of direct experience, but rather develop through a process of information acquisition and observation.*

40. Stewart, E. A., Baumer, E. P., Brunson, R. K., & Simons, R. L. (2009). Neighborhood racial context and perceptions of police-based discrimination among black youth. *Criminology*, 47(3), 847-887.

*The patterns we observed are most consistent with a defended neighborhood perspective, which predicts that racial discrimination against blacks will be most prevalent where a black migration into homogeneous white neighborhoods occurs with long-standing racial dominance. Whites are likely to align themselves with social institutions such as the criminal justice system, specifically the police, which allows them to defend their neighborhoods and protect their interests. As racial barriers break down and desegregation occurs, blacks who live in or migrate into largely white neighborhoods are perceived as threatening, which leads to intense police social control against blacks. Indeed, large concentrations of black residents resulted in greater police strength, but only when the black population was geographically proximate to white neighborhoods. When the black population was racially segregated or isolated from white neighborhoods, however, the number of police officers assigned to those areas was reduced.*

41. Taylor, T. J., Turner, K. B., Esbensen, F., & Winfree Jr., L. T. (2001). Coppin' an attitude: Attitudinal differences among juveniles toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(4), 295-305.

*The primary determinants of adolescent perceptions of law enforcement were the types of contacts, positive and negative, that the youths had with the police. Those juveniles who reported negative contacts with the police were negative in their views of law enforcement, while the converse was true for youths with positive experiences with the police.*

42. Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2004). Race and perceptions of police misconduct. *Social Problems*, 51(3), pp. 305-325.

*... race remains a key factor in structuring attitudes toward police misconduct even after controlling for these other variables. Race is a strong predictor in large part because blacks and Hispanics are more likely than whites to report having negative interactions with police, to be exposed to media reports of police misconduct, and to live in high-crime neighborhoods where policing may be contentious—each of which increases perceptions of police misconduct.*

43. Weitzer, R. J., & Tuch, S. A. (2005). Racially biased policing: Determinants of citizen perceptions. *Social Forces*, 83(3), 1009-1030.

*For most whites, racial discrimination in general, and police discrimination in particular, is not a serious problem in America. Minorities, by contrast, tend to*

*perceive racial discrimination in a wide range of institutional arenas, including housing, employment, and education.*

#### **Police interactions – Gang activity**

44. Tapia, M. (2011). Gang membership and race as risk factors for juvenile arrest. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 48(3), 364-395.

*The current trend of criminalizing gang membership, absent instant delinquency charges, or outstanding arrest warrants causes the interaction of gangs and race in the earliest stages of DMC to go undiscovered and unaddressed. Furthermore, the charges resulting from such arrest-on-sight gang injunctions are very likely to “stick.” Even one of the most prolific of gang researchers has recently commented that such injunctions are written so broadly as to defeat virtually any criminal defense to the charges in court. If these practices continue to go unchecked, the disproportionate arrest of poor, minority youth is likely to persist.*

#### **Arrest and referral**

45. Huizinga, D., Thornberry, T. P., Knight, K. E., Lovegrove, P. J., Loeber, R., Hill, K., et al. (2007). *Disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system: A study of differential minority arrest/referral to court in three cities*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

*DMC cannot be explained by differences in the offending behavior of different racial groups. ... The finding that DMC exists even after delinquency and a selection of risk factors were controlled, suggests that identification of additional factors that influence DMC, at least at some sites, is needed. Obvious among these are police decision making and the factors that influence such decision making (e.g., perceived public danger, availability of capable guardians, prior contact with offender, offender demeanor at time of contact, existence of police diversion programs or availability of community services, etc.), and factors influencing the likelihood of initial discovery and apprehension such as calls for service and patrol patterns, as well as additional individual characteristics.*

46. Kochel, T. R., Wilson, D. B., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2011). Effect of suspect race on officers arrest decisions. *Criminology*, 49(2), 473-512.

*Screening nearly 4,500 potential sources, we analyze the results based on 27 independent data sets that generated 40 research reports (both published and unpublished) that permitted an estimate of the effect size of the suspect's race on the probability of arrest. The meta-analysis shows with strong consistency that minority suspects are more likely to be arrested than White suspects. Depending on the method of estimation, the effect size of race varied between 1.32 and 1.52. Converting the race effect size to probabilities shows that compared with the average probability in these studies of a White being arrested (.20), the average probability for a non-White was calculated at .26.*

## Detention

47. Bell, J., Ridolfi, L. J., Finley, M., & Clinton, L. (2009). *The keeper and the kept: Reflections on local obstacles to disparities reduction in juvenile justice systems and a path to change*. San Francisco, CA: W. Haywood Burns Institute.

*This myth of detention as service, coupled with a real lack of alternatives to detention, contributes to an overreliance on detention as a vehicle to provide youth of color and poor youth with services. This reaction to a particular segment of youth in need is in stark contrast to the treatment of White and well-resourced youth who come into contact with the law for similar offenses.*

48. Holman, B., & Zeidenberg, J. (2006). *The dangers of detention: The impact of incarcerating youth in detention and other secure facilities*. Washington, D.C.: Justice Policy Institute.

*A recent literature review of youth corrections shows that detention has a profoundly negative impact on young people's mental and physical well-being, their education, and their employment. One psychologist found that for one-third of incarcerated youth diagnosed with depression, the onset of the depression occurred after they began their incarceration, and another suggests that poor mental health, and the conditions of confinement together conspire to make it more likely that incarcerated teens will engage in suicide and self-harm. Economists have shown that the process of incarcerating youth will reduce their future earnings and their ability to remain in the workforce, and could change formerly detained youth into less stable employees. Educational researchers have found that upwards of 40 percent of incarcerated youth have a learning disability, and they will face significant challenges returning to school after they leave detention. Most importantly, for a variety of reasons to be explored, there is credible and significant research that suggests that the experience of detention may make it more likely that youth will continue to engage in delinquent behavior, and that the detention experience may increase the odds that youth will recidivate, further compromising public safety.*

49. Leiber, M. J., & Fox, K. C. (2005). Race and the impact of detention on juvenile justice decision making. *Crime & Delinquency*, 51(4), 470-497.

*African American youth were more likely than were Whites to receive the more severe outcome at detention, initial appearance, and adjudication even after controlling for relevant legal and extralegal criteria and legal representation. Most of the relationships involved interaction effects among being African American and factors such as committing a drug offense, being from a single-parent household, committing crimes against persons, not having counsel, and the severity of the outcome for a prior referral. African Americans also moved further through the system because of the effect of detention on decision making at intake, initial appearance, and judicial disposition. Thus, the presence of African Americans in the juvenile justice system including detention can be*

*attributed to differential involvement in delinquency, differential selection, and detention, which to some degree is racially tainted.*

50. Rodriguez, N. (2010). The cumulative effect of race and ethnicity in juvenile court outcomes and why preadjudication detention matters. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 47(3), 391-413.

*The most extensive review of attributions of race in juvenile court outcomes found that court officials were more likely to assign negative internal attributions (e.g., juvenile's personality, attitude, and cooperativeness) to black youth and negative external attributions (e.g., delinquent peers, poor school performance, family conflict) to white youth. Furthermore, negative internal attributions were associated with perceptions of higher risk of reoffending and more severe disposition outcomes, which support the differential treatment argument. Unfortunately, the extent to which negative attributions serve to disadvantage other racial and ethnic groups is unknown. ... An important element of these racial and ethnic disparities is how they differ across juvenile court outcomes. For example, black youth received severe (diversion, detention, and out-of-home placement) and lenient (adjudication) treatment at different stages of processing while Latinos/as and American Indians only received more severe treatment across certain court outcomes (diversion and detention).*

51. Shook, J. J., & Goodkind, S. A. (2009). Racial disproportionality in juvenile justice: The interaction of race and geography in pretrial detention for violent and serious offenses. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(4), 257-266.

*We found significant racial disproportionality in detention decisions for violent and serious juvenile offenders. Whereas 82% of black youth were detained, only 58% of white youth were detained. Further, we found geographical differences, as 83% of youth within the city were detained compared to 57% from the suburbs. Bivariate examination also showed a difference by police department, as youth arrested by city police departments were more likely to be detained than those arrested by suburban police (81 vs. 64%). However, the multivariate analysis further specified the relationships among race, geography, and police department, demonstrating that youth's place of residence is more relevant to the detention decision than location of arresting police. We found a significant interaction between race and youth's residence and the plot of the slope of the interaction term showed the white youth from the suburbs were the least likely group to be detained. The predicted probabilities of detention showed that the likelihood of detention was, in fact, substantially less for white suburban youth than for black youth in the city or suburbs, for a variety of offenses. Interestingly, white youth from the city were the group most likely to be detained, although the differences in the predicted probabilities were small between white and black youth from the city.*

## Probation

52. Leiber, M. J., & Peck, J. H. (2013). Probation violations and juvenile justice decision making: Implications for blacks and Hispanics. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 11(1), 60-78.

*For the most part, nonsupport was found for the hypothesized race/ethnic interaction with probation violation and increased social control. Out of all court referrals in the sample, only 14% of the sample was comprised of probation violators. Whites (35%) and Blacks (57%) compared to Hispanics (8%), comprised a significant percentage of the overall sample for the study, as well as those charged with a probation violation. However, from examining within each racial/ethnic group, Hispanic youth comprise 30% of those charged with a probation violation, compared to 13% of White youth and 13% of Black youth (see Table 2). The significance of this finding for Hispanics charged with a probation violation is that an indirect effect between the two appears to contribute to further movement throughout court proceedings.*

53. Bridges, G. S., & Steen, S. (1998). Racial disparities in official assessments of juvenile offenders: Attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms. *American Sociological Review*, 63(4), 554-570.

*We find pronounced differences in probation officers' attributions about the causes of crime by white versus minority youths. Further, these differences contribute significantly to differential assessments of the risk of reoffending and to sentence recommendations, even after adjusting for legally relevant case and offender characteristics. These results suggest that differential attributions about the causes of crime act as a mediating factor between race and sentencing recommendations.*

54. Harris, A. (2009). Attributions and institutional processing: How focal concerns guide decision-making in the juvenile court. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(4), 243-256.

*Also assumed was that probation officers had the skills and predictive power to assess and label youths' character and future behavior based on social and legal histories and police reports found in youths' institutional files. It is important to note the lack of statistical or qualitative differences in the ways that the attributions were applied to black and Latino youth. In fact, it seemed that probation officers had consistent scripts that were guided by their focal concerns.*

*Theoretically, this study highlights a mechanism by which discretion is utilized within people-processing institutions. As illustrated here, probation officers frequently relied on value-based phrases involving notions of personal responsibility and public safety to generate rhetorical power. The characterization process, and the subsequent label that is attached to cases, is a mechanism connecting non-legal factors to processing outcomes. Importantly,*

*these characterizations follow individuals (literally in their case files) throughout their institutional careers, becoming formalized without question as a part of their legal histories*

55. Steen, S., Bond, C., Bridges, G. S., & Kubrin, C. E. (2005). Explaining assessments of future risk: Race and attributions of juvenile offenders in presentencing reports. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children: Confronting racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice*. (pp. 245-269). Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press.

*Probation officers use qualitatively different kinds of attributions and explanations. Probation officers relied on explanations about the immediate causes of the present offense, and why these causes would not lead to future offending in their assessments of low-risk youth. ... Probation officers were more likely to make attributions about their general character and problems in assessing moderate- or high-risk offenders. Explanations emphasizing a youth's attitude and the court's ability to intervene in particular ways were typical for moderate-risk youth; while in high-risk cases, explanations focused on a youth's character, values, or persistent life problems.*

#### **Legal representation**

56. Guevara, L., Spohn, C., & Herz, D. (2004). Race, legal representation, and juvenile justice: Issues and concerns. *Crime & Delinquency*, 50(3), 344-371.

*In summary, studies focusing on juvenile court outcomes generally find that youth represented by private attorneys are more likely than those represented by public defenders to have their cases dismissed and are less likely to be placed in secure confinement following adjudication. Research focusing on juvenile court outcomes also reveals, however, that youth appearing with counsel receive more severe outcomes than those appearing without counsel.*

57. Tanana, M., Davis, M., Castillo, J. T., & Próspero, M. (2011). Legal representation and education for minority youth intervention. *Journal of Forensic Social Work*, 1(2), 110-123.

*The state's juvenile sentencing guidelines were used to evaluate the legal representation practice. Multinomial regressions were conducted to examine the effect of legal representation and ethnicity on convictions and sanctions, controlling for criminal history and severity of offense. Results were that legal representation for both ethnic/racial minority and non-minority youth decreased the likelihood of convictions. However, legal representation was also associated with less and more severe sanctions than recommended sentencing guidelines. Taken together, legal representation for youth in juvenile court may lead to dismissal of criminal charges, but for those youth who are convicted, attorney presence may lead to receiving more severe sanctions.*

## Prosecutorial - Judicial

58. Bishop, D. M., Leiber, M., & Johnson, J. (2010). Contexts of decision making in the juvenile justice system: An organizational approach to understanding minority overrepresentation. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 8(3), 213-233.

*At prosecutorial charging, a tightly coupled juncture, we expected to find that offense-related factors would influence decision outcomes. We anticipated that race might interact with legal variables due to prevailing stereotypes of African American offenders as more dangerous than Whites. We predicted that contextual factors would have no impact. To a considerable extent, these expectations were met. Neither individual-level characteristics nor contextual ones influenced charging outcomes. Decisions were dominated by legal considerations, which interacted with race. We found that African Americans arrested for felony crimes were more likely than their White counterparts to be formally charged. Minorities were further disadvantaged at the charging stage by the apparent failure of prosecutors to prescreen their cases to the same extent as those involving Whites. Cases of African Americans defendants were allowed to go forward, regardless of the number of arrest charges involved. Among Whites, prosecutors were more careful in screening cases so that only the more egregious ones went forward.*

*... judges compensate at disposition for racial inequities that they are aware were introduced at earlier stages (here, by prosecutorial decisions to send forward cases involving African Americans, regardless of how many counts were involved, while being more selective in the prosecution of Whites). In our view, the loosely coupled nature of the disposition stage also gives judges more freedom to exercise discretion to correct for past disparate outcomes. That legal, demographic, and contextual considerations are all taken into account at disposition seem to reflect the larger and philosophically more diverse group of players who contribute to decision making at this stage and, at least as important, the broader set of values that they collectively espouse.*

## Section 6: References

- Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York; Jackson, Tenn.: New Press; Distributed by Perseus Distribution.
- Armstrong, G. S., & Rodriguez, N. (2005). Effects of individual and contextual characteristics on preadjudication detention of juvenile delinquents. *Justice Quarterly*, 22(4), 521-539.
- Bell, J., & Ridolfi, L. J. (2008). *Adoration of the questions: Reflections on the failure to reduce racial & ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system*. San Francisco, CA: W. Haywood Burns Institute.
- Bell, J., Ridolfi, L. J., Finley, M., & Clinton, L. (2009). *The keeper and the kept: Reflections on local obstacles to disparities reduction in juvenile justice systems and a path to change*. San Francisco, CA: W. Haywood Burns Institute.
- Reforming the juvenile justice system to improve children's lives and public safety: House Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, (2010).
- Bernburg, J. G., Krohn, M. D., & Rivera, C. J. (2006). Official labeling, criminal embeddedness, and subsequent delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 43(1), 67-88.
- Bishop, D. M. (2005). The role of race and ethnicity in juvenile justice processing. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children* (pp. 23-82). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bishop, D. M., & Frazier, C. E. (1988). The influence of race in juvenile justice processing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 25(3), 242-263.
- Bishop, D. M., & Frazier, C. E. (1996). Race effects in juvenile justice decision-making: Findings of a statewide analysis. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 86(2), 392-414.
- Bishop, D. M., Leiber, M., & Johnson, J. (2010). Contexts of decision making in the juvenile justice system: An organizational approach to understanding minority overrepresentation. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 8(3), 213-233.
- Bishop, D. M., Leiber, M., & Johnson, J. (2010). Contexts of decision making in the juvenile justice system: An organizational approach to understanding minority overrepresentation. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 8(3), 213-233.
- Bray, T. M., Sample, L. L., & Kempf-Leonard, K. (2005). "Justice by geography": Racial disparity and juvenile courts. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children: Confronting racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice*. (pp. 270-299). Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press.
- Bridges, G. S., & Steen, S. (1998). Racial disparities in official assessments of juvenile offenders: Attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms. *American Sociological Review*, 63(4), 554-570.

- Brunson, R. K. (2007). Police don't like black people?: African-American young men's accumulated police experiences. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 6(1), 71-101.
- Brunson, R. K., & Miller, J. (2006). Young black men and urban policing in the united states. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(4), 613-640.
- Brunson, R. K., & Weitzer, R. (2009). Police relations with black and white youths in different urban neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(6), 858-885.
- Cabaniss, E. R., Frabutt, J. M., Kendrick, M. H., & Arbuckle, M. B. (2007). Reducing disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system: Promising practices. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12(4), 393-401.
- Cahn, E., & Robbins, C. (2010). An offer they can't refuse: Racial disparity in juvenile justice and deliberate indifference meet alternatives that work. *University of the District of Columbia Law Review*, 13(1), 71-114.
- Chapman, J. F., Desai, R. A., Falzer, P. R., & Borum, R. (2006). Violence risk and race in a sample of youth in juvenile detention the potential to reduce disproportionate minority confinement. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 170-184.
- Crutchfield, R. D., Skinner, M. L., Haggerty, K. P., McGlynn, A., & Catalano, R. F. (2009). Racial disparities in early criminal justice involvement. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(4), 218.
- Davis, J., & Sorensen, J. R. (2010). Disproportionate minority confinement of juveniles: A national examination of Black–White disparity in placements, 1997-2006. *Crime & Delinquency*,
- Desai, R. A., Falzer, P. R., Chapman, J., & Borum, R. (2012). Mental illness, violence risk, and race in juvenile detention: Implications for disproportionate minority contact. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 82(1), 32-40.
- Dishion, T. J., & Dodge, K. A. (2005). Peer contagion in interventions for children and adolescents: Moving towards an understanding of the ecology and dynamics of change. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 33(3), 395-400.
- Feld, B. C. (1991). Justice by geography: Urban suburban, and rural variations in juvenile justice administration. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 82(1), 156-210.
- Feld, B. C. (2006). Police interrogation of juveniles: An empirical study of policy and practice. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1973-)*, 97(1), pp. 219-316.
- Fenning, P., & Rose, J. (2007). Overrepresentation of African American students in exclusionary discipline: The role of school policy. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 536-559.
- Freiburger, T. L., & Jordan, K. L. (2011). A multilevel analysis of race on the decision to petition a case in the juvenile court. *Race and Justice*, 1(2), 185-201.

- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 59-68.
- Guevara, L., Spohn, C., & Herz, D. (2004). Race, legal representation, and juvenile justice: Issues and concerns. *Crime & Delinquency*, 50(3), 344-371.
- Hanes, M. (2012). *OJJDP in focus: Disproportionate minority contact*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs.
- Harris, A. (2009). Attributions and institutional processing: How focal concerns guide decision-making in the juvenile court. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(4), 243-256.
- Hirschfield, P. J. (2008). Preparing for prison?: The criminalization of school discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12(1), 79.
- Holman, B., & Zeidenberg, J. (2006). *The dangers of detention: The impact of incarcerating youth in detention and other secure facilities*. Washington, D.C.: Justice Policy Institute.
- Hoytt, E. H., Schiraldi, V., Smith, B., & Ziedenberg, J. (2002). *Pathways to juvenile detention reform: Reducing racial disparities in juvenile detention*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Huizinga, D., Thornberry, T. P., Knight, K. E., Lovegrove, P. J., Loeber, R., Hill, K., et al. (2007). *Disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system: A study of differential minority Arrest/Referral to court in three cities*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Hurst, Y. G., Frank, J., & Browning, S. L. (2000). The attitudes of juveniles toward the police: A comparison of black and white youth. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(1), 37-53.
- Jargowsky, P. A., Desmond, S. A., & Crutchfield, R. D. (2005). Suburban sprawl, race, and juvenile justice. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children: Confronting racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice*. (pp. 167-201). Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, E. N. (2012). Disproportionate representation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system: A lack of clarity and too much disparity among states "addressing" the issue. *UC Davis Journal of Juvenile Law & Policy*, 16(1), 155-202.
- Kakade, M., Duarte, C. S., Liu, X., Fuller, C. J., Drucker, E., Hoven, C. W., et al. (2012). Adolescent substance use and other illegal behaviors and racial disparities in criminal justice system involvement: Findings from a US national survey. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(7), 1307-1310.
- Kakar, S. (2006). Understanding the causes of disproportionate minority contact: Results of focus group discussions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(4), 369-381.

- Kempf-Leonard, K. (2007). Minority youths and juvenile justice: Disproportionate minority contact after nearly 20 years of reform efforts. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 5(1), 71-87.
- Kirk, D. S. (2008). The neighborhood context of racial and ethnic disparities in arrest. *Demography*, 45(1), 55-77.
- Kochel, T. R., Wilson, D. B., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2011). Effect of suspect race on officers arrest decisions. *Criminology*, 49(2), 473-512.
- LaMotte, V., Ouellette, K., Sanderson, J., Anderson, S. A., Kosutic, I., Griggs, J., et al. (2010). Effective police interactions with youth: A program evaluation. *Police Quarterly*, 13(2), 161-179.
- Lauritsen, J. L. (2005). Racial and ethnic differences in juvenile offending. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children* (pp. 83-103). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Leiber, M. J., & Jamieson, K. M. (1995). Race and decision making in juvenile justice: The importance of context. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11(4), 363-384.
- Leiber, M. J., Johnson, J., Fox, K., & Lacks, R. (2007). Differentiating among racial/ethnic groups and its implications for understanding juvenile justice decision making. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(5), 471-484.
- Leiber, M. J., & Peck, J. H. (2012). Race, gender, crime severity, and decision making in the juvenile justice system. *Crime & Delinquency*,
- Leiber, M. J., & Stairs, J. M. (1999). Race, contexts, and the use of intake diversion. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36(1), 56-86.
- Leiber, M. J. (1994). A comparison of juvenile court outcomes for Native Americans, African Americans, and whites. *Justice Quarterly*, 11(2), 257-279.
- Leiber, M. J. (2002). Disproportionate minority confinement (DMC) of youth: An analysis of state and federal efforts to address the issue. *Crime & Delinquency*, 48(1), 3-45.
- Leiber, M. J., & Boggess, L. N. (2012). Race, probation violations, and structured secure detention decision making in three jurisdictions. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 10(4), 333-353.
- Leiber, M. J., & Fox, K. C. (2005). Race and the impact of detention on juvenile justice decision making. *Crime & Delinquency*, 51(4), 470-497.
- Leiber, M. J., & Johnson, J. D. (2008). Being young and black: What are their effects on juvenile justice decision making? *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(4), 560-581.
- Leiber, M. J., & Mack, K. Y. (2003). The individual and joint effects of race, gender, and family status on juvenile justice decision-making. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(1), 34-70.

- Leiber, M. J., & Mack, K. Y. (2003). The individual and joint effects of race, gender, and family status on juvenile justice decision-making. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(1), 34-70.
- Leiber, M. J., & Peck, J. H. (2013). Probation violations and juvenile justice decision making: Implications for blacks and Hispanics. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 11(1), 60-78.
- Leiber, M., Bishop, D. M., & Chamlin, M. B. (2011). Juvenile justice decision-making before and after the implementation of the disproportionate minority contact (DMC) mandate. *JQ: Justice Quarterly*, 28(3), 460-492.
- Leiber, M., & Rodriguez, N. (2011). The implementation of the disproportionate minority Confinement/Contact (DMC) mandate. *Race and Justice*, 1(1), 103-124.
- Mallett, C. A., & Stoddard-Dare, P. (2010). Predicting secure detention placement for African-American juvenile offenders: Addressing the disproportionate minority confinement problem. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, 8(2), 91-103.
- Mauer, M. (2007). Racial impact statements as a means of reducing unwarranted sentencing disparities. *Ohio St.J.Crim.L.*, 5, 19.
- McCarter, S. (2009). Legal and extralegal factors affecting minority overrepresentation in Virginia's juvenile justice system: A mixed-method study. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 26(6), 533-544.
- Nellis, A., & Richardson, B. (2010). Getting beyond failure: Promising approaches for reducing DMC. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 8(3), 266-276.
- Nellis, A. M. (2005). *Seven steps to develop and evaluate strategies to reduce disproportionate minority contact (DMC)*. Washington, D.C.: Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center.
- Novak, K. J., & Chamlin, M. B. (2012). Racial threat, suspicion, and police behavior. *Crime & Delinquency*, 58(2), 275-300.
- Piliavin, I., & Briar, S. (1964). Police encounters with juveniles. *American Journal of Sociology*, 70(2), pp. 206-214.
- Piquero, A. R. (2008). Disproportionate minority contact. *The Future of Children*, 18(2), 59-79.
- Pope, C. E., & Feyerherm, W. (1995). *Minorities and the juvenile justice system: Research summary*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Pope, C. E., Lovell, R., & Hsia, H. M. (2002). *Disproportionate minority confinement: A review of the research literature from 1989 through 2001*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Pope, C. E., & Leiber, M. J. (2005). Disproportionate minority Confinement/Contact (DMC): The federal initiative. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children: Confronting*

*racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice.* (pp. 351-389). Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press.

- Rodriguez, N. (2007). Juvenile court context and detention decisions: Reconsidering the role of race, ethnicity, and community characteristics in juvenile court processes. *Justice Quarterly*, 24(4), 629-656.
- Rodriguez, N. (2010). The cumulative effect of race and ethnicity in juvenile court outcomes and why preadjudication detention matters. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 47(3), 391-413.
- Rodriguez, N., Smith, H., & Zatz, M. S. (2009). Youth is enmeshed in a highly dysfunctional family system: Exploring the relationship among dysfunctional families, parental incarceration, and juvenile court decision making. *Criminology*, 47(1), 177-208.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). Structural variations in juvenile court processing: Inequality, the underclass, and social control. *Law & Society Review*, 27(2), pp. 285-312.
- Sampson, R. J., & Lauritsen, J. L. (1997). Racial and ethnic disparities in crime and criminal justice in the united states. *Crime and Justice*, 21(Ethnicity, Crime and Immigration: Comparative and Cross-National Perspectives), 311-374.
- Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2004). Seeing disorder: Neighborhood stigma and the social construction of "broken windows". *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67(4), 319-342.
- Schuck, A. M., Rosenbaum, D. P., & Hawkins, D. F. (2008). The influence of Race/Ethnicity, social class, and neighborhood context on residents' attitudes toward the police. *Police Quarterly*, 11(4), 496-519.
- Schulenberg, J. L. (2010). Patterns in police decision-making with youth: An application of Black's theory of law. *Crime, Law, and Social Change*, 53, 109-129.
- Sealock, M. D., & Simpson, S. S. (1998). Unraveling bias in arrest decisions: The role of juvenile offender type-scripts. *Justice Quarterly*, 15(3), 427-457.
- Shook, J. J., & Goodkind, S. A. (2009). Racial disproportionality in juvenile justice: The interaction of race and geography in pretrial detention for violent and serious offenses. *Race and Social Problems*, 1(4), 257-266.
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *Urban Review*, 34(4), 317.
- Steen, S., Bond, C., Bridges, G. S., & Kubrin, C. E. (2005). Explaining assessments of future risk: Race and attributions of juvenile offenders in presentencing reports. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children: Confronting racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice.* (pp. 245-269). Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press.

- Stevenson, P. J., Lavery, T., Burke, K. S., Alderden, M., Martin, C., Myrent, M., et al. (2003). *Study of disproportionate minority representation in the Cook County juvenile justice system*. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
- Stewart, E. A., Baumer, E. P., Brunson, R. K., & Simons, R. L. (2009). Neighborhood racial context and perceptions of police-based discrimination among black youth. *Criminology*, 47(3), 847-887.
- Tanana, M., Davis, M., Castillo, J. T., & Próspero, M. (2011). Legal representation and education for minority youth intervention. *Journal of Forensic Social Work*, 1(2), 110-123.
- Tapia, M. (2011). Gang membership and race as risk factors for juvenile arrest. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 48(3), 364-395.
- Tapia, M. (2010). U.S. juvenile arrests: Gang membership, social class, and labeling effects. *Youth & Society*,
- Taylor, T. J., Turner, K. B., Esbensen, F., & Winfree Jr., L. T. (2001). Coppin' an attitude: Attitudinal differences among juveniles toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(4), 295-305.
- Tracy, P. E. (2005). Race, ethnicity, and juvenile justice: Is there bias in post-arrest decision making? In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children* (pp. 300-350). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ward, G., Kupchik, A., Parker, L., & Starks, B. C. (2011). Racial politics of juvenile justice policy support. *Race and Justice*, 1(2), 154-184.
- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2004). Race and perceptions of police misconduct. *Social Problems*, 51(3), pp. 305-325.
- Weitzer, R. J., & Tuch, S. A. (2005). Racially biased policing: Determinants of citizen perceptions. *Social Forces*, 83(3), 1009-1030.
- Zimring, R. (2005). Minimizing harm from minority disproportion in American juvenile justice. In D. F. Hawkins, & K. Kempf-Leonard (Eds.), *Our children, their children: Confronting racial and ethnic differences in American juvenile justice*. (pp. 413-427). Chicago, IL, US: University of Chicago Press.

# Appendices & Qualitative Analysis

APPENDIX 1 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS: POLICE

APPENDIX 2 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS: DETENTION

APPENDIX 3 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS: PUBLIC DEFENDER

APPENDIX 4 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS: STATE’S ATTORNEYS

APPENDIX 5 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS: PROBATION

APPENDIX 6 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS: JUDICIARY

APPENDIX 7 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS: DJJ

APPENDIX 8 – KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS: POLICY

APPENDIX 9 - ILLINOIS JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM SURVEY

APPENDIX 10 - ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF POLICE CHIEF (ILACP) WEEKLY BULLETIN ALERT

APPENDIX 11 - KEY INFORMANT’S STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

APPENDIX 12 - SURVEY RESPONDENTS INFORMED CONSENT

APPENDIX 13 - KEY INFORMANT AND SURVEY RESPONDENT REPRESENTATION BY ILLINOIS COUNTY MINORITY POPULATION

Center for Prevention Research & Development,  
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - POLICE  
DMC Qualitative Analysis**

1. Can you tell me what agency you work in and what your role is?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. How long have you worked in the juvenile justice system?
4. Can you tell me how closely the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?
5. Are you familiar with Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)?
6. How would you define DMC?
7. Have you ever attended training on DMC?
8. Was this training mandated by your agency?
9. What were the top 3 items you took away with you from the training?
10. Did you feel the training was worthwhile? If yes, how so?
11. Do you perceive DMC as an issue within your department?
  - Within the juvenile justice system?
12. Do you feel all youth are treated equally in the juvenile justice system?
  - If no, could you expand on some of the ways you feel injustice is occurring?
13. Of the major Decision Points along the path of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court) – where do you feel the most discretion is permitted in how juveniles are handled?
14. Do you feel this discretion is appropriate? And if so, why – or why not?
15. Have you ever witnessed an incident where youth were treated differently?
  - Could you explain the circumstances?
  - Did you agree with the outcome you witnessed?
16. Do you believe the concept of preventing DMC is widely accepted? Widely practiced?
17. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) can you rate how large of an issue DMC is in your area?

18. How do you think preventing DMC could become more of a culture than a requirement?
19. If you could rate your agency's efforts at preventing DMC, what rating would you give? 1 (low) to 5 (high).
20. Do you feel that the mandating of DMC guidelines has been helpful for you?  
your agency?     the juvenile justice system?
21. Does your agency collect the offender's Race and Ethnicity?
  - a. Do you collect race/ethnicity as part of your job responsibilities? Or do you just know your agency collects race/ethnicity?
  - b. If yes, could you explain the processes for this collection that you know?
22. Does your agency use (if applicable)
  - a. Standardized risk and assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - b. Clinical needs assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - c. Standardized detention admission tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - d. Culturally sensitive services?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - e. Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - f. Zero Tolerance in Schools
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - g. Any other tools?
23. If you could change anything about DMC requirements in your work place what would it be?
24. When you stop a youth during your daily job duties – what makes you decide whether to make an arrest? A station adjustment? Or send them home?
25. When was the last time you had an interaction with a youth that made you angry or afraid?
  - a. Could you describe the circumstances of that experience?
26. What is the culture within your department of how juveniles should be treated?
27. Is there anything else you would like to share about DMC?

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - DETENTION  
DMC Qualitative Analysis**

1. Can you tell me what agency you work in and what your role is?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. How long have you worked in the juvenile justice system?
4. Can you tell me how closely the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?
5. Are you familiar with Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)?
6. How would you define DMC?
7. Have you ever attended training on DMC?
8. Was this training mandated by your agency?
9. What were the top 3 items you took away with you from the training?
10. Did you feel the training was worthwhile? If yes, how so?
11. Do you perceive DMC as an issue within your department?
  - Within the juvenile justice system?
12. Do you feel all youth are treated equally in the juvenile justice system?
  - If no, could you expand on some of the ways you feel injustice is occurring?
13. Of the major Decision Points along the path of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court) – where do you feel the most discretion is permitted in how juveniles are handled?
14. Do you feel this discretion is appropriate? And if so, why – or why not?
15. Have you ever witnessed an incident where youth were treated differently?
  - Could you explain the circumstances?
  - Did you agree with the outcome you witnessed?
16. Do you believe the concept of preventing DMC is widely accepted? Widely practiced?
17. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) can you rate how large of an issue DMC is in your area?

18. How do you think preventing DMC could become more of a culture than a requirement?
19. If you could rate your agency's efforts at preventing DMC, what rating would you give? 1 (low) to 5 (high).
20. Do you feel that the mandating of DMC guidelines has been helpful for you?  
your agency? the juvenile justice system?
21. Does your agency collect the offender's Race and Ethnicity?
  - a. Do you collect race/ethnicity as part of your job responsibilities? Or do you just know your agency collects race/ethnicity?
  - b. If yes, could you explain the processes for this collection that you know?
22. Does your agency use (if applicable)
  - a. Standardized risk and assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - b. Clinical needs assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - c. Standardized detention admission tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - d. Culturally sensitive services?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - e. Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - f. Zero Tolerance in Schools
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - g. Any other tools?
23. If you could change anything about DMC requirements in your work place what would it be?
24. During your interactions with youth during your daily job duties – what makes you decide whether to sanction a youth?
25. When was the last time you had an interaction with a youth that made you angry or afraid?
  - a. Could you describe the circumstances of that experience?
26. What is the culture within your department of how juveniles should be treated?
27. Is there anything else you would like to share about DMC?

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS – PUBLIC DEFENDER  
DMC Qualitative Analysis**

1. Can you tell me what agency you work in and what your role is?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. How long have you worked in the juvenile justice system?
4. Can you tell me how closely the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?
5. Are you familiar with Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)?
6. How would you define DMC?
7. Have you ever attended training on DMC?
8. Was this training mandated by your agency?
9. What were the top 3 items you took away with you from the training?
10. Did you feel the training was worthwhile? If yes, how so?
11. Do you perceive DMC as an issue within your department?
12. Do you feel all youth are treated equally in the juvenile justice system?
13. Of the major Decision Points along the path of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court) – where do you feel the most discretion is permitted in how juveniles are handled?
14. Do you feel this discretion is appropriate? And if so, why – or why not?
15. Have you ever witnessed an incident where youth were treated differently?
  - Could you explain the circumstances?
  - Did you agree with the outcome you witnessed?
16. Do you believe the concept of preventing DMC is widely accepted? Widely practiced?
17. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) can you rate how large of an issue DMC is in your area?
18. How do you think preventing DMC could become more of a culture than a requirement?

19. If you could rate your agency's efforts at preventing DMC, what rating would you give? 1 (low) to 5 (high).
20. Do you feel that the mandating of DMC guidelines has been helpful for you?  
your agency? the juvenile justice system?
21. Does your agency collect the offender's Race and Ethnicity?
  - a. Do you collect race/ethnicity as part of your job responsibilities? Or do you just know your agency collects race/ethnicity?
  - b. If yes, could you explain the processes for this collection that you know?
22. Does your agency use (if applicable)
  - a. Standardized risk and assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - b. Clinical needs assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - c. Culturally sensitive services?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - d. Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - e. Zero Tolerance in Schools
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - f. Any other tools?
23. If you could change anything about DMC requirements in your work place what would it be?
24. Do you feel that your clients are treated differently because of their race? Ethnicity?  
If yes, by whom?
25. When was the last time you had an interaction with a youth that made you angry or afraid?
  - a. Could you describe the circumstances of that experience?
26. What is the culture within your department of how juveniles should be treated?
27. Is there anything else you would like to share about DMC?

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS – STATE’S ATTORNEY  
DMC Qualitative Analysis**

1. Can you tell me what agency you work in and what your role is?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. How long have you worked in the juvenile justice system?
4. Can you tell me how closely the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?
5. Are you familiar with Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)?
6. How would you define DMC?
7. Have you ever attended training on DMC?
8. Was this training mandated by your agency?
9. What were the top 3 items you took away with you from the training?
10. Did you feel the training was worthwhile? If yes, how so?
11. Do you perceive DMC as an issue within your department?
  - Within the juvenile justice system?
12. Do you feel all youth are treated equally in the juvenile justice system?
  - If no, could you expand on some of the ways you feel injustice is occurring?
13. Of the major Decision Points along the path of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court) – where do you feel the most discretion is permitted in how juveniles are handled?
14. Do you feel this discretion is appropriate? And if so, why – or why not?
15. Have you ever witnessed an incident where youth were treated differently?
  - Could you explain the circumstances?
  - Did you agree with the outcome you witnessed?
16. Do you believe the concept of preventing DMC is widely accepted? Widely practiced?
17. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) can you rate how large of an issue DMC is in your area?
18. How do you think preventing DMC could become more of a culture than a requirement?

19. If you could rate your agency's efforts at preventing DMC, what rating would you give? 1 (low) to 5 (high).
20. Do you feel that the mandating of DMC guidelines has been helpful for you?  
your agency? the juvenile justice system?
21. Does your agency collect the offender's Race and Ethnicity?
  - a. Do you collect race/ethnicity as part of your job responsibilities? Or do you just know your agency collects race/ethnicity?
  - b. If yes, could you explain the processes for this collection that you know?
22. Does your agency use (if applicable)
  - a. Standardized risk and assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - b. Clinical needs assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - c. Culturally sensitive services?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - d. Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - e. Zero Tolerance in Schools
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - f. Any other tools?
23. If you could change anything about DMC requirements in your work place what would it be?
24. When you review a case to make a decision about filing a petition or not filing one – what are you looking for to help you make your decision?
25. When was the last time you had an interaction with a youth that made you angry or afraid?
  - a. Could you describe the circumstances of that experience?
26. What is the culture within your department of how juveniles should be treated?
27. Is there anything else you would like to share about DMC?

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - PROBATION  
DMC Qualitative Analysis**

1. Can you tell me what agency you work in and what your role is?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. How long have you worked in the juvenile justice system?
4. Can you tell me how closely the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?
5. Are you familiar with Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)?
6. How would you define DMC?
7. Have you ever attended training on DMC?
8. Was this training mandated by your agency?
9. What were the top 3 items you took away with you from the training?
10. Did you feel the training was worthwhile? If yes, how so?
11. Do you perceive DMC as an issue within your department?
  - Within the juvenile justice system?
12. Do you feel all youth are treated equally in the juvenile justice system?
  - If no, could you expand on some of the ways you feel injustice is occurring?
13. Of the major Decision Points along the path of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court) – where do you feel the most discretion is permitted in how juveniles are handled?
14. Do you feel this discretion is appropriate? And if so, why – or why not?
15. Have you ever witnessed an incident where youth were treated differently?
  - Could you explain the circumstances?
  - Did you agree with the outcome you witnessed?
16. Do you believe the concept of preventing DMC is widely accepted? Widely practiced?
17. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) can you rate how large of an issue DMC is in your area?

18. How do you think preventing DMC could become more of a culture than a requirement?
19. If you could rate your agency's efforts at preventing DMC, what rating would you give? 1 (low) to 5 (high).
20. Do you feel that the mandating of DMC guidelines has been helpful for you?  
your agency? the juvenile justice system?
21. Does your agency collect the offender's Race and Ethnicity?
  - a. Do you collect race/ethnicity as part of your job responsibilities? Or do you just know your agency collects race/ethnicity?
  - b. If yes, could you explain the processes for this collection that you know?
22. Does your agency use (if applicable)
  - a. Standardized risk and assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - b. Clinical needs assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - c. Standardized detention admission tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - d. Culturally sensitive services?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - e. Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - f. Zero Tolerance in Schools
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - g. Any other tools?
23. If you could change anything about DMC requirements in your work place what would it be?
24. When you meet with a youth during your daily job duties – what makes you decide whether to violate their probation?
25. When was the last time you had an interaction with a youth that made you angry or afraid?
  - a. Could you describe the circumstances of that experience?
26. What is the culture within your department of how juveniles should be treated?
27. Is there anything else you would like to share about DMC?

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - JUDICIARY**  
**DMC Qualitative Analysis**

1. Can you tell me what judicial circuit you work in and what your role is?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. How long have you worked in the juvenile justice system?
4. Can you tell me how closely the demographics of your community match the demographics the judiciary?
5. Are you familiar with Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)?
6. How would you define DMC?
7. Have you ever attended training on DMC?
8. Was this training mandated?
9. What were the top 3 items you took away with you from the training?
10. Did you feel the training was worthwhile? If yes, how so?
11. Do you perceive DMC as an issue within the judiciary or circuit?
  - Within the juvenile justice system?
12. Do you feel all youth are treated equally in the juvenile justice system?
  - If no, could you expand on some of the ways you feel injustice is occurring?
13. Of the major Decision Points along the path of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court) – where do you feel the most discretion is permitted in how juveniles are handled?
14. Do you feel this discretion is appropriate? And if so, why – or why not?
15. Have you ever witnessed an incident where youth were treated differently?
  - Could you explain the circumstances?
  - Did you agree with the outcome you witnessed?
16. Do you believe the concept of preventing DMC is widely accepted? Widely practiced?
17. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) can you rate how large of an issue DMC is in your area?
18. How do you think preventing DMC could become more of a culture than a requirement?

19. If you could rate the judiciary's efforts at preventing DMC, what rating would you give? 1 (low) to 5 (high).
20. Do you feel that the mandating of DMC guidelines has been helpful for you?  
the judiciary? the juvenile justice system?
21. Does the judiciary collect the offender's Race and Ethnicity?
  - a. Do you collect race/ethnicity as part of your job responsibilities? Or do you just know your agency collects race/ethnicity?
  - b. If yes, could you explain the processes for this collection that you know?
22. Does the judiciary use (if applicable):
  - a. Standardized risk and assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - b. Clinical needs assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - c. Standardized detention admission tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - d. Culturally sensitive services?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - e. Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - f. Zero Tolerance in Schools
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - g. Any other tools?
23. If you could change anything about DMC requirements in your work place what would it be?
24. When you render a decision on a juvenile in court – what do you consider when making your decision?
25. When was the last time you had an interaction with a youth that made you angry or afraid?
  - a. Could you describe the circumstances of that experience?
26. What is the culture of how juveniles should be treated?
27. Is there anything else you would like to share about DMC?

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - DJJ  
DMC Qualitative Analysis**

1. Can you tell me what agency you work in and what your role is?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. How long have you worked in the juvenile justice system?
4. Can you tell me how closely the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?
5. Are you familiar with Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)?
6. How would you define DMC?
7. Have you ever attended training on DMC?
8. Was this training mandated by your agency?
9. What were the top 3 items you took away with you from the training?
10. Did you feel the training was worthwhile? If yes, how so?
11. Do you perceive DMC as an issue within your department?
  - Within the juvenile justice system?
12. Do you feel all youth are treated equally in the juvenile justice system?
  - If no, could you expand on some of the ways you feel injustice is occurring?
13. Of the major Decision Points along the path of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court) – where do you feel the most discretion is permitted in how juveniles are handled?
14. Do you feel this discretion is appropriate? And if so, why – or why not?
15. Have you ever witnessed an incident where youth were treated differently?
  - Could you explain the circumstances?
  - Did you agree with the outcome you witnessed?
16. Do you believe the concept of preventing DMC is widely accepted? Widely practiced?
17. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) can you rate how large of an issue DMC is in your area?

18. How do you think preventing DMC could become more of a culture than a requirement?
19. If you could rate your agency's efforts at preventing DMC, what rating would you give? 1 (low) to 5 (high).
20. Do you feel that the mandating of DMC guidelines has been helpful for you?  
your agency? the juvenile justice system?
21. Does your agency collect the offender's Race and Ethnicity?
  - a. Do you collect race/ethnicity as part of your job responsibilities? Or do you just know your agency collects race/ethnicity?
  - b. If yes, could you explain the processes for this collection that you know?
22. Does your agency use (if applicable)
  - a. Standardized risk and assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - b. Clinical needs assessment tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - c. Standardized detention admission tools?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - d. Culturally sensitive services?
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - e. Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - f. Zero Tolerance in Schools
    - i. If yes, please describe
  - g. Any other tools?
23. If you could change anything about DMC requirements in your work place what would it be?
24. During your interactions with youth during your daily job duties – what makes you decide whether to sanction a youth?
25. When was the last time you had an interaction with a youth that made you angry or afraid?
  - a. Could you describe the circumstances of that experience?
26. What is the culture within your department of how juveniles should be treated?
27. Is there anything else you would like to share about DMC?

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS- Policy  
DMC Qualitative Analysis**

1. Can you tell me what agency you work in and what your role with DMC is/was?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. How long have you worked in the juvenile justice system?
4. Can you tell me how closely the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?
5. Are you familiar with Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)?
6. How would you define DMC?
7. Have you ever attended training on DMC?
8. Was this training mandated by your agency?
9. What were the top 3 items you took away with you from the training?
10. Did you feel the training was worthwhile? If yes, how so?
11. Do you perceive DMC as an issue within the juvenile justice system?
12. Do you feel all youth are treated equally in the juvenile justice system?
  - If no, could you expand on some of the ways you feel injustice is occurring?
13. Of the major Decision Points along the path of the juvenile justice process (arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court) – where do you feel the most discretion is permitted in how juveniles are handled?
14. Do you feel this discretion is appropriate? And if so, why – or why not?
15. Have you ever witnessed an incident where youth were treated differently?
  - Could you explain the circumstances?
  - Did you agree with the outcome you witnessed?
16. Do you believe the concept of preventing DMC is widely accepted? Widely practiced?
17. On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) can you rate how large of an issue DMC is in your area?
18. How do you think preventing DMC could become more of a culture than a requirement?
19. If you could rate agency's efforts at preventing DMC, what rating would you give? 1 (low) to 5 (high).

20. Do you feel that the mandating of DMC guidelines would be helpful to the juvenile justice system?
  
21. Are you familiar with data collection practices on offender's Race and Ethnicity?
  - a. Do you collect race/ethnicity as part of your job responsibilities? Or do you just know your agency collects race/ethnicity?
  - b. If yes, could you explain the processes for this collection that you know?
  
22. If you could change anything about DMC requirements in the work place what would it be?
  
23. Is there anything else you would like to share about DMC?

# Illinois Juvenile Justice System Survey

## SECTION 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What County do you currently work in? (If retired, please state the last county you worked in; if you work in more than one county, select the largest one.)

\_\_\_\_\_

2. In what year did you begin working in your current field?

- Prior to 2000     2000-2004     2005 - 2009     2010 - present

3. Are you retired?

- Yes     No

4. In what year did you begin working for your current employer?

- Prior to 2000     2000 - 01     2002 - 03     2004 - 05     2006 - 07     2008 - 09     2010 - 11     2012

5. What is your current occupation?

- Department of Juvenile Justice Staff  
 Detention Staff  
 Judge/Other Court official  
 Probation Officer/Court Services staff  
 Police/other Law Enforcement  
 Prosecutor/State's Attorney  
 Public Defender/other Attorney  
 Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

6. How closely do the demographics of your community match the demographics of your agency personnel?

- Fewer minorities in my agency     More minorities in my agency     About the same     Don't know

## SECTION 2 - INTERACTION WITH JUVENILES

7. How do you typically determine the age of a person when you stop or interact with a person. In other words, how do you determine if they are a juvenile or not? (Select all that apply)

- I ask them their age  
 I look at their driver's license and determine their age  
 I look them up on my computer  
 Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

8. How do you typically determine the ethnicity/race of a person when you stop or interact with a person. (Select all that apply)

- I ask them their ethnicity/race  
 I look at their driver's license and determine their ethnicity/race  
 I look them up on my computer  
 Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

9. Do you report the ethnicity/race of the juvenile?

- Yes     No     Don't know

**SECTION 3 - PERCEPTIONS/SOCIAL CONDITIONS**

**10. In my community:**

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Don't Know	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The juvenile court is too lenient.	<input type="radio"/>				
Youth are arrested for many things that should be handled by their parents.	<input type="radio"/>				
Police are tougher on people of color (non-whites).	<input type="radio"/>				
Police tend to treat poor people and rich people differently.	<input type="radio"/>				
People with high income get better legal advice and representation than people with low income.	<input type="radio"/>				
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be arrested by police, even for similar behavior.	<input type="radio"/>				
The juvenile court is too punitive.	<input type="radio"/>				
Juvenile courts need to employ more people of color.	<input type="radio"/>				
The court treats native English speakers better than people with little or no English.	<input type="radio"/>				
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be transferred to adult court, even for similar charges.	<input type="radio"/>				
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be adjudicated in court, even for similar charges.	<input type="radio"/>				
People of color are reluctant to stand up for their legal rights in court.	<input type="radio"/>				
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be prosecuted by the justice system, even for similar charges.	<input type="radio"/>				
Youth of color are more likely than white youth to be confined by the justice system, even for similar charges.	<input type="radio"/>				

**11. I trust the following groups to deal with juveniles in the justice system fairly:**

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Don't Know	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Corrections Staff	<input type="radio"/>				
Detention Staff	<input type="radio"/>				
Judges and other court personnel	<input type="radio"/>				
Police and other law enforcement personnel	<input type="radio"/>				
Probation Officers and other probation staff	<input type="radio"/>				
Social Service agencies	<input type="radio"/>				
Prosecutors and other State's Attorney personnel	<input type="radio"/>				
Public Defenders and other Public Defender staff	<input type="radio"/>				
Teachers and other school officials	<input type="radio"/>				

**12. The way juveniles are handled by the justice system is influenced by the juvenile's:**

	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Don't Know	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Ability to speak English	<input type="radio"/>				
Access to social services	<input type="radio"/>				
Age	<input type="radio"/>				
Community's attitudes towards youth	<input type="radio"/>				
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	<input type="radio"/>				
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	<input type="radio"/>				
Family connections	<input type="radio"/>				
Family living situation	<input type="radio"/>				
Gang affiliation	<input type="radio"/>				
Gender	<input type="radio"/>				
General demeanor and appearance	<input type="radio"/>				
History of violent behavior	<input type="radio"/>				
Intelligence	<input type="radio"/>				
Local culture	<input type="radio"/>				
Mental Health issues	<input type="radio"/>				
Record of prior offenses	<input type="radio"/>				
Parent's attitudes	<input type="radio"/>				
Parent's involvement	<input type="radio"/>				
Religion	<input type="radio"/>				
Sexual Orientation	<input type="radio"/>				
Socio-economic status	<input type="radio"/>				
Stereotypes	<input type="radio"/>				
Success in school	<input type="radio"/>				

**13. Have you seen any discrimination of youth in the juvenile justice system that involved the juvenile's:**

	Yes	No
Ability to speak English	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Age	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cultural, ethnic or racial background	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Drug and/or alcohol behavior	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Family connections	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Family living situation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gang affiliation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
General demeanor and appearance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
History of violent behavior	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intelligence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Local culture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental Health issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Record of prior offenses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parent's attitudes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parent's involvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Religion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sexual Orientation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Socio-economic status	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. At each decision point in the juvenile justice process how much discretion is allowed by the juvenile justice staff?

	None	A little	A good bit	Don't Know
Initial Police Contact	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Station Adjustment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arrest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Decision to transfer to Adult Court	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Detention Hearing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Detention staff in a Detention facility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Delinquency Petition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adjudication Hearing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Probation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sentencing Hearing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Juvenile Justice Staff in a Juvenile Justice facility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Aftercare (Parole) staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. Juvenile crime and delinquency is relatively common in most communities as youth struggle with the transition from childhood through adolescent and into young adulthood. To better understand your perceptions with different groups of juveniles, we would like to know the gender, race and ethnicity of the juveniles that you encounter in your position. Based on your observations and experiences as a police officer, probation officer, etc., in your current community, how would you estimate the percentage of youth for the following gender, race and ethnic groups (ages 10-17) that are committing status offenses, delinquent and other criminal acts in each of the groups and subgroups? Select the closest percent provided.

15A. Status Offenses (e.g., curfew violations, runaways, etc.)

	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
White males	<input type="radio"/>				
White females	<input type="radio"/>				
Black males	<input type="radio"/>				
Black females	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino males	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino females	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian males	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian females	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (Please specify):	<input type="radio"/>				

**15B. Vandalism or property crimes**

	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
White males	<input type="radio"/>				
White females	<input type="radio"/>				
Black males	<input type="radio"/>				
Black females	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino males	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino females	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian males	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian females	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (Please specify):	<input type="radio"/>				

**15C. Illicit or illegal drug use**

	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
White males	<input type="radio"/>				
White females	<input type="radio"/>				
Black males	<input type="radio"/>				
Black females	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino males	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino females	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian males	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian females	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (Please specify):	<input type="radio"/>				

**15D. Underage alcohol use**

	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
White males	<input type="radio"/>				
White females	<input type="radio"/>				
Black males	<input type="radio"/>				
Black females	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino males	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino females	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian males	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian females	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (Please specify):	<input type="radio"/>				

**15E. Shoplifting, Petty Theft or Stealing**

	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
White males	<input type="radio"/>				
White females	<input type="radio"/>				
Black males	<input type="radio"/>				
Black females	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino males	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino females	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian males	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian females	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (Please specify):	<input type="radio"/>				

**15F. Assault and Battery**

	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%
White males	<input type="radio"/>				
White females	<input type="radio"/>				
Black males	<input type="radio"/>				
Black females	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino males	<input type="radio"/>				
Hispanic\Latino females	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian males	<input type="radio"/>				
Asian females	<input type="radio"/>				
Other (Please specify):	<input type="radio"/>				

**SECTION 4 - RULES/PROCEDURES/DECISION MAKING**

**16. How familiar are you with the concept of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system?**  
 Not familiar at all    Somewhat familiar    Very familiar

**17. How familiar are your professional colleagues with the concept of DMC in the juvenile justice system?**  
 Not familiar at all    Somewhat familiar    Very familiar    Don't know

**18. Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?**  
 Yes    No    Don't know

19. Have you ever participated in meetings or trainings on juvenile offenders that addressed the following Evidence-based Practices?

Yes

No

Not  
Applicable to  
my position

Standardized risk and assessment tools

Clinical needs assessment tool

Standardized detention admission tools

Culturally sensitive offender services

Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)

Zero Tolerance in Schools

Any other? (please specify):

20. If you have participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC, to what extent has your participation changed how you do your job?

Not at all

Some

A good bit

21. Do you believe that you are making different decisions towards the involved youth than you were before you participated in meetings or trainings that addressed DMC?

Yes

No

If Yes, please describe:

22. Does your agency have any policy and procedures documentation that addresses DMC?

Yes

No

Don't know

23. Are the DMC policies and procedures followed within your agency?

Not at all

Some

Completely

Don't know

## SECTION 5 - DEMOGRAPHICS

24. What is your current age?

<20

26-30

36-40

46-50

56-60

>65

20-25

31-35

41-45

51-55

61-65

25. What is your Ethnicity?

Hispanic

Non-Hispanic

26. What is your Race?

Black/African American

White/Caucasian

Asian

Native American or Native Alaskan

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

Multiracial

Other (please specify):

PLEASE DO NOT PHOTOCOPY THIS SURVEY

**27. What is your gender?**

- Male     Female

**28. What is your current level of education?**

- High school  
 Technical/Vocation school  
 Some college  
 College graduate  
 Graduate school

**Thank you!**

# *ILACP Weekly Bulletin Alert*

Thursday, August 9, 2012 <http://www.ilchiefs.org> E-Mail: [ilacp@ilchiefs.org](mailto:ilacp@ilchiefs.org) Vol. 2012  
No. 30

*John Kennedy, Executive Director - Linda Kunz, Executive Assistant  
Debbie Guerro, Receptionist & Certification Coordinator - Katie Sample, Accounting & Grants Coordinator*

Phone 217-523-3765; Toll Free 877-244-3345; Fax 217-523-8352

## **ILLINOIS JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ONLINE SURVEY**

The ILACP has been asked by the University of Illinois, the Center for Prevention Research and Development ([www.cprd.illinois.edu](http://www.cprd.illinois.edu)) to forward information about an important juvenile justice online survey to you. This research will be part of a report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) on processes, procedures and Disproportionate Minority Confinement in the Illinois juvenile justice system. Please take 20 minutes to complete this important online survey. It is important to engage law enforcement personnel to ensure that everyone's voice is heard.

**The online survey will be available from August 1 through August 17, 2012. There is a \$25 Amazon gift e-card incentive to those individuals that complete and submit their survey. And, I have been assured that the survey is completely anonymous.** Link to consent and the survey: <https://surveys.cprd.illinois.edu/rws5.pl?FORM=IJSS>

All current (and former) sworn officers that are currently involved (or have been at some time in their career) in dealing with juveniles should take this survey. They can be officers on the street to management or even retired. And we want the officers that receive the online survey to know that they can share the online survey link with colleagues.

**An invitation from the research group is linked Here:**  
**[http://www.ilchiefs.org/data/n\\_0001/resources/live/Online-survey-UIC-CPRD.pdf](http://www.ilchiefs.org/data/n_0001/resources/live/Online-survey-UIC-CPRD.pdf)**

Thank you to everyone that participates. You are helping an important initiative.

John Kennedy, Executive Director  
Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police

**KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS**  
**Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission Research**  
**2012**

**Statement of Confidentiality – To be read to Key Informant at beginning of interview**  
**Consent to Tape Record**

---

My name is Susan Witkin. I am a member of a research team from the University of Illinois' Center for Prevention Research and Development that is researching the policies, procedures and culture for handling, assessing and making decisions on all juveniles entering or moving through the Illinois juvenile justice system.

The purpose of this interview is to better understand how decisions are made by the agencies and people interacting with juveniles that get involved in the juvenile justice system.

Your participation is completely voluntary and you may refuse to answer any questions or stop the interview process at any time. All information you provide will be confidential and you will not be identified by name, role or position in any reports.

I have a copy of this statement for you to keep along with contact information if you have questions.

May I have your consent to continue?

[Proceed if yes; terminate if no]

And may I have permission to tape record our conversation in order to accurately record your responses?

[Proceed if yes; do not roll tape if no]

[Interviewer: Roll tape and repeat the question concerning permission to tape record and their affirmative response so that it is recorded.]

Begin questions...

---

If you have any questions, or would like more information about this research, please contact Susan Witkin at [witkin@illinois.edu](mailto:witkin@illinois.edu) or Peter Mulhall at [mulhall@illinois.edu](mailto:mulhall@illinois.edu), or call toll free at 877-255-7078. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this project, you may call the Institutional Review Board at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign at 217-333-2670 (you may call collect) or contact them at [irb@illinois.edu](mailto:irb@illinois.edu).

## Illinois Juvenile Justice System Survey

Welcome to All Participants,

As someone working with juveniles and involved in the Illinois juvenile justice system, you are in an ideal position to understand the processes that affect the stated OJJDP (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention) Decision Points - arrest, referral, diversion, detention, petitions/charges filed, findings/adjudication hearing, probation, confinement and transfers to adult court.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois, under the direction of Dr. Peter Mulhall, is conducting research for the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission (IJJC). This research focuses on the Illinois juvenile justice agency's policies, procedures, decision making and culture for handling juveniles entering or moving through the juvenile justice system, with interest on Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC).

Susan Witkin and Peter Mulhall are the primary research investigators of this study. Results from this research will assist us in learning more about why and how decisions about juveniles are made in Illinois. We need your input.

By clicking on the survey link at the bottom of this page, you are providing your consent to take part in the on-line survey. Before you agree, there are a few important things you should know:

### Consent Statement

- ❖ Surveys are completed anonymously. All information from the survey will be kept **private and confidential**. No names or identifiers will be associated with your participation. To maintain your confidentiality, individual names, e-mail addresses, and computer IP addresses will not be collected. Results will be summarized and used by the research team to understand more about DMC and the Illinois juvenile justice system.
- ❖ Your participation in this survey is **completely voluntary**. If there are questions that you do not want to answer, you may skip those questions, and you can exit the survey at any time. Your decision to participate, decline, or withdraw from participation will have no effect on your current status as a juvenile justice employee.
- ❖ There are no risks involved in participating in the on-line survey other than the unintended discomfort you may feel in response to some of the questions. For example, some of the items on the survey ask for your opinions. If you feel uncomfortable at any time, you may skip any question or exit the survey at any point in time.

If you have any questions about this evaluation, please contact Susan Witkin at [witkin@illinois.edu](mailto:witkin@illinois.edu) or Peter Mulhall at [mulhall@illinois.edu](mailto:mulhall@illinois.edu) or call toll free (877) 255-7078. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at 217-333-2670 (collect calls will be accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at [irb@illinois.edu](mailto:irb@illinois.edu).

***"I have read and understand this Consent Statement and voluntarily agree to participate."***

If you want a copy of this document for your records, please print a paper copy now.

Please click on the link below to provide your consent and begin the survey.

**< Insert Survey Link Here >**

**Thank you for your participation!**

**Key Informant & Survey Respondent Representation by Illinois County Minority Population**

(Source: - U.S. Census Quick Facts, 2011 est.)

County	African American %	Hispanic or Latino %	Total Minority %	Total Population	KI(s)	SR(s)
1. Cook	25.0	24.4	49.4	5,217,080	✓	✓
2. Alexander	35.8	2.0	37.8	8,036		
3. Kane	6.1	31.1	37.2	520,271		✓
4. Pulaski	32.3	1.7	34	6,046	✓	
5. St. Clair	30.5	3.4	33.9	270,259	✓	✓
6. Lake	7.4	20.3	27.7	706,222		✓
7. Will	11.5	15.9	27.4	681,545		✓
8. Brown	19.0	5.9	24.9	6,878		✓
9. Kankakee	15.5	9.2	24.7	113,698		✓
10. Winnebago	12.5	11.2	23.7	293,993	✓	✓
11. Boone	2.5	20.3	22.8	54,367		✓
12. Kendall	6.1	15.9	22	116,631	✓	✓
13. Peoria	17.9	4.0	21.9	186,834	✓	✓
14. Rock Island	9.3	11.9	21.2	147,556	✓	✓
15. Cass	3.8	17.3	21.1	13,579		
16. Jackson	14.7	4.3	19	60,365		✓
17. DuPage	5.1	13.6	18.7	923,222		✓
18. Macon	16.4	2.0	18.4	110,730	✓	✓
19. Champaign	12.7	5.5	18.2	201,685	✓	✓
20. Vermilion	13.3	4.4	17.7	81,509		✓
21. DeKalb	6.8	10.5	17.3	104,743		✓
22. Sangamon	12.0	1.9	13.9	198,844	✓	✓
23. Lawrence	10.0	3.5	13.5	16,745		✓
24. McHenry	1.3	11.7	13	308,944		✓
25. Whiteside	1.7	11.2	12.9	58,388		✓
26. Randolph	10.0	2.7	12.7	33,361		✓
27. Knox	7.6	4.9	12.5	52,917		✓
28. Stephenson	9.3	3.1	12.4	47,563		✓
29. McLean	7.6	4.6	12.2	170,556	✓	✓
30. Johnson	8.5	3.1	11.6	12,654		
31. Perry	8.8	2.8	11.6	22,264		
32. Warren	2.1	8.9	11	17,818		✓
33. Logan	7.9	3.1	11	30,140		
34. Madison	8.0	2.9	10.9	268,459	✓	✓
35. Jefferson	8.7	2.2	10.9	38,713	✓	✓
36. La Salle	2.1	8.3	10.4	113,518		✓
37. Lee	5.2	5.1	10.3	35,467		✓
38. Ogle	1.1	9.1	10.2	53,115		✓
39. Grundy	1.6	8.4	10	50,130		✓
<b>Total population of 39 counties with highest minority populations</b>				<b>11,354,845</b>		
<b>Total Illinois population</b>				<b>12,869,257</b>		

County	African American %	Hispanic or Latino %	Total Minority %	Total Population	KI(s)	SR(s)
<b>% of total Illinois population in above 39 counties</b>				<b>88%</b>		
<b>Illinois minority population (African American + Hispanic/Latino)</b>				<b>31%</b>		
40. Bond	6.5	3.2	9.7			
41. Livingston	5.2	4.1	9.3			✓
42. Bureau	0.8	7.9	8.7			
43. Morgan	6.3	2.2	8.5			
44. McDonough	5.4	2.8	8.2			✓
45. Pope	6.7	1.5	8.2			
46. Massac	5.9	2.0	7.9			✓
47. Douglas	0.6	6.4	7			
48. Crawford	4.9	2.1	7			✓
49. Iroquois	1.0	5.7	6.7			✓
50. Henry	1.8	4.9	6.7			✓
51. Clinton	3.8	2.9	6.7			✓
52. Coles	4.2	2.3	6.5			✓
53. Fulton	3.8	2.5	6.3			✓
54. Union	1.1	5.1	6.2			✓
55. Williamson	4.2	2.0	6.2			✓
56. Fayette	4.6	1.5	6.1			
57. Saline	4.3	1.6	5.9			✓
58. Marion	4.1	1.5	5.6			✓
59. Putnam	0.8	4.3	5.1			
60. Montgomery	3.4	1.6	5			✓
61. Adams	3.6	1.3	4.9			✓
62. Schuyler	3.2	1.6	4.8			✓
63. Carroll	1.0	3.1	4.1			✓
64. Jo Daviess	0.6	2.8	3.4			
65. Ford	0.9	2.4	3.3			
66. Tazewell	1.3	2.0	3.3			✓
67. Marshall	0.5	2.7	3.2			
68. Christian	1.7	1.5	3.2			
69. De Witt	0.7	2.2	2.9			✓
70. Pike	1.8	1.1	2.9			
71. Effingham	0.4	1.9	2.3			
72. Mercer	0.4	1.9	2.3			
73. Washington	0.8	1.5	2.3			
74. Woodford	0.7	1.5	2.2			✓
75. Wabash	0.8	1.4	2.2			✓
76. Richland	0.7	1.4	2.1			✓
77. Hamilton	0.6	1.4	2			
78. Menard	0.9	1.1	2			
79. Macoupin	1.0	1.0	2			✓
80. Greene	1.1	0.9	2			
81. Franklin	0.5	1.4	1.9		✓	✓

Appendix 13  
Qualitative Analysis

County	African American %	Hispanic or Latino %	Total Minority %	Total Population	KI(s)	SR(s)
82. Hardin	0.5	1.4	1.9			
83. White	0.6	1.3	1.9			
84. Stark	0.7	1.2	1.9			
85. Monroe	0.4	1.4	1.8			
86. Clark	0.5	1.3	1.8			✓
87. Clay	0.5	1.3	1.8			✓
88. Edgar	0.6	1.2	1.8			
89. Piatt	0.6	1.2	1.8			
90. Gallatin	0.4	1.3	1.7			
91. Edwards	0.7	1.0	1.7			✓
92. Jersey	0.5	1.1	1.6			
93. Wayne	0.5	1.1	1.6			
94. Mason	0.6	1.0	1.6			✓
95. Cumberland	0.7	0.9	1.6			
96. Henderson	0.3	1.2	1.5			
97. Hancock	0.4	1.1	1.5			
98. Moultrie	0.5	1.0	1.5			
99. Shelby	0.5	1.0	1.5			✓
100. Calhoun	0.1	1.1	1.2			
101. Jasper	0.3	0.9	1.2			✓
102. Scott	0.2	0.9	1.1			